

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXIX.]

SEPTEMBER, 1860.

[VOL. XVI.

COQUEREL ON PREACHING.*

No one is better qualified to give practical hints on preaching than M. Coquerel, whose ministry of forty years has been (from the first we believe) a continued and ever rising success, his success being at every step the result of devoted application. Preaching is more decidedly an *art* in France than in England; and M. Coquerel has studied and practised it as an art, earnestly, deliberately, perseveringly, and the more artistically because it is a *sacred* art. He rightly feels that his experience enables him to contribute to the success of younger fellow-labourers in the ministry; and not only so, but to promote among the laity that true appreciation of a minister's work which, in the genuine spirit of Protestantism, may be offered and accepted as his best help.

The present work, we learn, is of more limited scope than the author had originally and long contemplated. He had conceived the idea of a "History of Eloquence as regarded from the Christian point of view." It was to have begun with the ancient models and masters of the art; and after ascertaining how far their rules and examples are applicable to modern Christian preaching, would have traced the latter through its varied history before and since the Reformation, with especial reference of course to the French pulpit. For this larger work he had made considerable preparation, and does not relinquish it without regret at a time of life when he must forego "les longs projets et les vastes pensées;" but he thinks he may still "do a useful service to our churches by putting to paper the recollections and experience of a preacher's career of more than forty years."

If this book is in certain respects less directly calculated to do service to our English churches, its use is still very great to both ministers and people among us, inasmuch as the Christian ministry has essentially the same purposes in both countries; and those parts of the book which most strongly reflect the nationality of the French Protestant Church in distinction from the English, are in turn especially interesting and valuable to us in that point of view. They may even afford some useful hints for the im-

* Observations Pratiques sur la Predication. Par Athanase Coquerel, un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Reformée à Paris. Pp. 327. 12mo. 1860.

provement of the English pulpit, where the difference is merely that of national habit and not of intrinsic national character.

We shall confine ourselves to a brief analysis of the contents of this book,—the old and too much neglected mode of *review*, which will tell our readers what they may find in detail if they take up M. Coquerel's work, or may more generally prove to be its substitute in their hands, unless it should be translated into English. This, however, is scarcely probable, judging from the very limited encouragement hitherto given to translations of other books by the same author and his family, less characteristically French in their contents than the present volume.

The preliminary chapter sets up a truly high standard of pulpit eloquence, and proportionately expresses the laboriousness of the preacher's office, being well calculated to rectify the common lay idea implied in the frequent “*pénible encouragement*,” *A sermon costs you so little!*

The second chapter is on the danger of imitation. “There are no such things as models of the art of speaking; he who seeks for them and makes choice from among them is utterly mistaken, since the best originals will furnish the sorriest copies; all imitation must border upon aping; the first condition for the orator to fulfil is *to be himself*; and if he is but mediocre or poor, his consolation, I ought to say his resource, will be, to be himself at all events. Native individuality may, up to a certain point, supply the place of talent.” One of those lively personal reminiscences follows, which are frequent (but not too frequent indeed) in this book, giving weight as well as animation to its contents. It has reference to the author's early career. Preaching before “*un sévère aréopage de vieux experts dans l'art*,” he somewhat boldly ventured upon “*a real prose poem, rounded with description and apostrophe, and recited with unfailing memory and an impetuosity of tone and gesticulation quite absurd, but quite natural and free.*” The audience were surprised, a little stunned (*abasourdi*), and on due reflection pronounced stern judgment: it was like a strolling player's preaching (*une prédication d'his-trion*); nothing was to be hoped from it, and preaching was the last thing in the world that he should attempt. The young preacher was somewhat alarmed by so harsh a verdict; but one of his friends, not much above his own age, whispered him, “*Never mind; go on still; you have shewn yourself as you really are, and that is the essential thing.*” He adds, “*This expression was a sort of revelation to me; it has unceasingly resounded in my ear, and from that time I could never understand how any course of instruction in eloquence could commence with any but this precept, *Soyez ce que vous êtes.**” It is the source of genuine excellence in every department.

Instead of the imitation of models, the young preacher needs good *hints and criticisms* to correct his own style. “*No preacher*

knows how he himself preaches; some one must tell him. If sins of ignorance are rare in morals, they are very common in eloquence; a man cannot charge them upon himself; and when he tries to correct them, he does not know whether he has really succeeded." "Neither propriety and elegance of gesture, nor the appropriate use of the voice, are things to be taught, but things to be gained by correction." Every one has his own characteristics from nature and habit; and these have to be regulated and corrected, but they are not to be communicated by any oratorical art. The method adopted by the venerable Jean Monod in our author's student days (p. 24), and now employed at Geneva under Prof. Munier, receives his warm approval. It agrees with the method introduced into our York College by Mr. Bartlett many years ago, and no doubt continued in that institution in Manchester and London since. The young men read or recite, and the teacher points out what is incorrect or awkward. He does not attempt to *make* the elocutionist, but to *chasten* him. But when M. Coquerel suggests to the young pastor to choose a friend or two from among his auditors as censors of his pulpit services, and invite their criticisms from time to time as to his improvement or relapse in matter and delivery, we feel that, in England at least, censors competent to so delicate a task are seldom to be found; and the very suggestion represents the preacher's office to us in a more prominently artistic light than we are disposed to welcome. Nor could our ministers, we think, easily gain the habit of setting their auditors to talk about the sermon, questioning the more attentive, observing the impressions they have received, and studying the success obtained, in order to know how far they have carried the spiritual education of their hearers (p. 134).

In distinguishing the different *kinds of eloquence* (ch. iv.), our author refers to his five years' acquaintance with the debates of the Legislative Assembly, and states that of all the great parliamentary orators of that time, there were only two whose eloquence he could imagine capable of adapting itself with propriety to the pulpit. So special does he consider the characteristics of pulpit eloquence to be.

Discussing next the *best kinds of sermons*, he finds all kinds good, for variety's sake, "except tiresome ones," and excepting most decidedly allegorical and typical sermons. The exegetical, he thinks, are too much neglected among Protestant preachers. On the "choice of a text," he insists that the text *be* a text to the discourse, and not "an excrescence (comme une superfétation) still demanded by usage, but of which there is really no need." "To choose a text is to place one's instructions under the sanction of an authority which it would be a contradiction to evict after having invoked it." And he insists that the preacher must keep to the real and natural meaning of the text, corrected when

necessary by sound criticism. He does not seem to us very happy in all his instances of texts taken in their apparent but not real sense. On the following, at least, it is by no means admitted that the obvious meaning is a mistaken one: “By detaching from their context the words of Job, *If a man die, shall he live again?* (xiv. 14), it seems as if the problem of immortality was proposed in them in a manner favourable to the purposes of eloquence. But the sense is, *If a man die without being cleared of the calumnies which have pursued him, without having won back his good name, will he revive to claim it?* and this has no reference whatever to the future life.” Certainly he who interprets the above passage with M. Coquerel ought to preach accordingly, and we admire the fine morality which says, “This faithfulness of the preacher to the real sense of the text is more than a mere precept of oratory; it is clear that we have no right to make the Bible deliberately say anything but what it does say; one may be excused for a mistake, but not for a deliberate one” (p. 82). To some instructive instances of the good and evil choice of a text, he candidly adds a mistake of his own. After being chosen pastor by the French Church at Amsterdam in 1818, and at Bordeaux in 1823, he was recalled to Amsterdam in 1825, and took for the text of his initiatory sermon, 2 Cor. xiii. 1, *This is the third time I am coming to you.* “The number three had seduced me (he says), and in fact the reckoning was right; but I had much ado to put into the discourse all that suited the occasion. I still hear the murmur of the audience caused by my reading this singular text, and our mutual edification suffered from it” (p. 91).

An admirable chapter follows on *witty and ingenious sermons* (de l'esprit dans les sermons). The French are fond of putting *de l'esprit* into everything, and have sometimes carried it into the pulpit; yet, to their credit it is to be said, less often than the more northern nations of Europe. Our author lays it down as a principle that “an amusing sermon must always be a bad sermon.”

He next warns the young preacher against rocks and shoals (de quelques écueils de la prédication). Personality is denounced; anecdotes are almost absolutely proscribed; as are also all quotations from other than sacred books, excepting the works of the chief reformers, and short maxims, &c., from other writers. Poetical quotations are considered even more out of taste than prose ones. Long comparisons, elaborate descriptions, and “lyric and bucolic sermons” (by which he explains himself to mean such compositions as seem to echo of *Young's Night Thoughts* and *Harvey's Tombs*), are sternly refused admission into the pulpit of Protestant eloquence.

The next subjects treated of are, pulpit boldness (hardiesse), allusion to passing events (actualité), the education of the audi-

ence by preaching, and the question of age. In this last the difference is pointed out between the Catholic and the Protestant minister, with the former of whom, be he young or old, the *opus operatum* is everything, while with the latter the *personnel* is ever changing and ought to be growing in power for good. To the young preacher he beautifully says, “The surest way of obtaining the result which St. Paul recommended to Timothy, saying, *Let no man despise thy youth*, is, always to remember yourself that you are young.” Such happy turns of thought and expression as this characterize the book throughout.

At the fifteenth chapter we come to the *composition of sermons*. Plan and method are essential, but without formality and uniformity of division. These are unnatural. The division may arise either out of the subject or out of the text. The want of method is stated to be the commonest fault of preachers, betraying want of industry on their part, and causing the loss of all tangible impression on the part of the hearers. *Gradation* is a part of method, and our author has excellent hints on *exordium* and *peroration* especially. He mentions a sermon of his own, the opening of which was so striking that its publication was requested, though the friends who asked for it remembered nothing beyond that exordium. From this incident he learnt two rules: “to resist the temptation of an *abrupt* exordium, and to attach great importance to the peroration.”

The *three modes of preaching* are next discussed in order: the written sermon read from the pulpit, the same recited *memoriter*, and the extempore method. The reading plan, as pursued chiefly in England, receives no mercy at his hands. It is “le froid système de lecture.” He cannot conceive of eloquence in reading. A manuscript is a sheet of ice interposed between the orator and his audience. He is witty upon the English bishop or clergyman with his large velvet cushion, larger even than his manuscript, with no other gesture than that of turning over his pages, and at rare intervals what is called *the waving of the hand*, “that is, the exertion of raising the hand, to let it drop again instantly on the edge of the pulpit.” He is a little one-sided, however, in saying that the Dissenters meanwhile have been aiming at true oratory; and not very well informed (for he could hardly judge so ill, we think) in placing Spurgeon with Irving as the model of emulation among the most popular of the established clergy (p. 259). He has some amusing anecdotes, given with evident gusto, of preachers from notes turning over two leaves at once, or devising means for mitigating the nuisance of having to turn over the leaves at all, when a different action would better suit the oratory, &c.; and admitting, as he is forced to do, that some readers have been among the most eloquent of preachers, he only says they have triumphed over an obstacle which has overthrown many of their compeers, and “if they read so well, how would it have

been if they had preached without book?" Probably they would have altogether failed, is our reply.

Memoriter preaching is, he says (speaking of the French Protestant preachers), by far the most common method; and it is that which he recommends to all young ministers "for a noviciate of several years" at any rate, as the only safe mode of ultimately attaining the extemporaneous method, which he regards as the true preaching wherever attainable. He would have them always write the discourse in full with extreme care, and even make a fair copy of it. He gives this special French reason for the most minute care in composition and for exactness of verbal committal to memory: that "the French is the most prudish of languages, forgiving no mistake and permitting no compromise." The young orator is recommended to recite his discourse aloud in his study; and when the hour comes, he is to take his manuscript with him into the pulpit to be ready in case of failure of memory, but to keep it quite out of sight unless such an unfortunate exigence should occur. "A Christian audience will more easily bear with a young man's failure of memory, than pardon his idleness if he reads, or his presumption if he extemporizes."

For a considerable part of his early ministry M. Coquerel himself preached *memoriter*, and had no expectation of attaining the extempore faculty. But two occasions put him to the proof—the unexpected demand for a charity sermon at Leyden, where he had arrived on a Saturday night; and a benefit society's meeting at Paris at which he felt impelled to refute on the spot a Saint-Simonian intrusion. In this way he thinks the memoriter preacher will, on some occasion or other, find his extempore faculty, if he has it. Probably so; but we may be permitted to doubt whether the former habit really cultivates or leads to the latter faculty. And we feel disposed to give much more force than he will allow to the objection made against *rote* preaching, of producing "constraint, affectation, undue emphasis, stiffness of gesture and excess of intonation; whereas extempore speech leads to a more natural, warm and *sympathetic delivery*." To this objection he replies, that "many instances protest against the justice of these alternatives. If memory is sure of her matter, the elocution will not incur the alleged faults; and even the delivery of an extempore discourse may be as much out of keeping as the discourse itself." Our own observation leads us to maintain the contrary. It seems to us perfectly easy for a judicious ear to distinguish a memoriter sermon or speech from an extempore one, by the ever-recurring disproportion, in defect or in excess, between the matter and the delivery, if not even by false intonations and evident *parroting*. An extempore speech, if *désordonné* in matter, will be proportionally and appropriately so in delivery, because it will be *sympathique* throughout, the irregularity and disjointedness of manner sympathizing with the

same qualities in the matter. Many a genuine piece of rough oratory recurs to mind.

The *memoriter* mode of preaching, which seems to be the rule in France, is, we believe, the exception in England and America. Usually, among us it is either extempore or by reading. The former method is chiefly adopted by the *Evangelical* church and the Orthodox Dissenters, the latter chiefly by the *High and Broad* church and by the Unitarians. The few exceptions in every class confirm the rule. Certainly there is but little extempore preaching in this country that would come up to M. Coquerel's idea. The best of what passes for such is, we believe, usually *memoriter*, this method prevailing among the Independent and Baptist Dissenters of the more educated order, where, however, the visible manuscript would too directly defy the cherished illusion that the preacher speaks "as the spirit gives him utterance." But some few of the most advanced of these men venture even to read their discourses from the book.

We have no hesitation in expressing the conviction that *good* extempore preaching is the highest style of all; and that, with ordinary popular audiences, the extempore method, even in a less perfect style, may be more effective than written addresses of a much higher order. But if the question be asked in reference to English Unitarian congregations, a very different answer must be given. No extempore preaching but the very best would do there; and the majority of our ministers find their best written discourses more acceptable and useful than their best *extempore* efforts could be. Taking men of their average attainments, and congregations of the average social and mental rank that ours bear, we believe that, as a general rule, our ministers will combine the greatest amount of excellence and command the best usefulness as preachers, by writing their discourses and reading them as they ought to be read. We also maintain that more men are capable of good reading than of good improvisation. Our Unitarian congregations insist upon a fulness of sound matter, a clearness of order, correctness of composition and propriety of illustration, at any rate, that are seldom found in strictly extempore sermons. And if the choice is to lie between a good sermon well read and the same sermon recited from memory, they would look upon the latter as a poor device well dispensed with, and think their minister's time better employed in other studies than in the mechanical labour of putting his manuscript into his memory. Once throw away the transparent delusion of speaking by immediate divine suggestion, and this seems to follow. Or let the ignorant auditor who insists upon retaining it sit *under* the pulpit, or anywhere out of sight of the preacher's note-book, when the preacher whom we are speaking of reads his sermon *in the way in which he would have spoken it the moment he wrote it*, and our auditor will accept a sermon so

delivered as the true extemporaneous speech on which he so strongly insists.

On this subject of extempore preaching (*improvisation*), it is curious to compare our author with Mr. Henry Ware, whose "Hints" on the same subject are well known in England, and are twice referred to approvingly by M. Coquerel. Each regards this as the most effective mode of pulpit address, and gives many admirable rules for its attainment. Each also strongly deprecates the idea of adopting it as an easy-going, idle way of preaching, or a *pis-aller* for want of time. But it is observable that Mr. Ware recommends it earnestly to those who desire progress in theological knowledge on the express ground "that it redeems time for study," and he thinks an hour enough for the preparation of a sermon.*

M. Coquerel, on the other hand, repeatedly disclaims the idea of saving time by his method. Indeed, it is plain that writing in full and committing to memory must demand an increased expenditure of time; and this, we must remember, is his *regime* for all preachers till by its means they come to *improvise*. Improvisation proper he defines indeed essentially as Mr. Ware does: "The speaker knows what he is going to say, but not how he shall say it" (p. 193). But he seems to represent the composition of sermons, whether by writing or meditation, as an incessant work. The preacher is to have a sermon always on the stocks (*toujours un sermon sur le métier*). He repudiates as a deceptive antithesis that precept of the Abbé Gros de Besplas, which we are disposed to cherish as the true rule for good sermons as soon as a man can afford to act upon it: "Do not summon your thoughts because you want to compose a sermon; but compose a sermon because you have thoughts ready: God alone can create from nothing." Extempore preaching is, as M. Coquerel well says, both the easiest thing to do and the most difficult; easy (to some people at least) if talking is all, difficult indeed if such speech be meant as he has described.

Mr. Ware, it is observable, never recommends *memoriter* preaching, either for itself or as a preparation for the extempore method. It does not occur to him to regard the one as a step to the other. But M. Coquerel traces their analogy thus:

"For extempore preaching it is, if possible, still more necessary than for memoriter preaching, that the composition of the discourse be complete in all its parts. To write a sermon on paper in order to learn it by heart, and to write it, as I may say, in one's head to speak off-hand, are essentially the same operation of mind, varying only in form; their difference being, that the one entrusts to the pen both the ideas and the

* "A very large proportion of the topics on which a minister should preach, have been subjects of his attention a thousand times. He is thoroughly familiar with them; and an hour to arrange his ideas and collect illustrations is abundantly sufficient."

words, the other entrusts the ideas to memory and leaves their development for improvisation. If these considerations are just, it is inexcusable rashness to improvise without having composed; it is immeasurable folly to imagine that an *extempore* sermon is to be an *impromptu* one." P. 217.

It seems to us that the so-called "difference in form" is the essential difference in the art. Composition,—in the sense of material, arrangement, argument, illustration, application,—is required in all cases; the developement by language at the time is the one great difference to the preacher. We see not how the habit of reciting from memory can aid the acquisition of this power, unless so far as the change is less *conspicuous* than that of dispensing with the accustomed manuscript. At all events, Mr. Ware addresses his suggestions directly to the acquisition of the power of *extempore* utterance, without regarding the memoriter method as intermediate or auxiliary. His object was, in fact, to help young Americans and Englishmen to extemporize instead of reading; whereas M. Coquerel's is to help young Frenchmen to extemporize instead of committing to memory. And the latter is yet more careful than the former to leave no room for slovenly *impromptu*. His chapter of hints on improvisation (ch. xxi.) is truly excellent.

We must hasten to the end of our remarks. "The continuous work of the preacher" is so described as to forbid the possibility of his sinking into routine. Revelation and Christianity are inexhaustible; the minister's vocation imposes upon him the necessity of progress: if he removes to a new sphere of duty, the calls upon him vary, and he must adapt himself to them; or if he fulfils his whole ministry in one place, new wants grow up there, a new generation comes, and he must walk on with it. Another chapter compares *the moral and artistic aspects of preaching*. Another, "on the *importance of the sermon in public worship*," may seem, to English ideas, if not to exaggerate its absolute value, yet to disparage in comparison the devotional services and reading and exposition of the Scriptures; but at any rate it rightly describes the relative time and labour required to be bestowed in a minister's preparation for his pulpit; and in this respect every one confesses the *primaute du sermon*. An encouraging chapter on the *good done by preaching*, and one on the *responsibility of the pulpit*, conclude this delightful volume. We have already given so many short extracts as to illustrate sufficiently its style and contents; but a longer one tempts us as historically descriptive of the last half century of Protestantism in France, and bearing obvious comparison with the experience of liberal Christianity in England. He is speaking of the work of a minister as continuous and progressive when he says,

"My own ministry has realized this experience. I might in vain have desired to follow old tracks. I had to apply the verse,

'Times are changed no less than place.'

"There was no difficulty in understanding that it would be useless to preach at Paris as I had done at Amsterdam, and that a different religious sphere required a different exposition and defence of religion. The course of time and progress of ideas also brought a corresponding lesson. While, for twenty years and more, an exclusive system prevailed, and its leaders replied to our proposals of peace, *There is an abyss between you and us* (an abyss so far from deep that at present we cross it daily), I thought it my duty to expose and combat such disastrous tendencies; I thought that the advocacy of peace and Christian truth was inseparable from the defence of liberty. I think so still, and do not at all repent of having, not begun indeed, but sustained my part in, that distressing but necessary struggle. Of those efforts, in which the most eminent of my colleagues pledged their future, as I did mine, we are reaping the fruits. We owe it to that resistance which cost us so much, that we see religious liberty at the present day better understood and better welcomed in most of our churches; harmony reviving, and theological studies pursued without retrogradation. But though I feel no regret for having sustained this controversy, I should have great scruples in being the first to revive it at present. Why? Because men's minds are following another direction. The opponents of conciliation, who have read nothing for a quarter of a century, find themselves in a desert in proportion as they hang back; the last defenders of intolerance within the Protestant Church are more and more forsaken; and sectarian epithets are growing out of use. Preaching was bound to assume a different shade and a new range. I have, like many others, joyfully made a holocaust of old discourses, as my offering on the altar of peace; and I am much mistaken if many of my dear brethren, in conjunction with whom I maintained the good cause, have not come to believe with me that this victory is sufficiently well assured to allow of our aiming at further progress."—P. 243.

MEMORIALS OF DR. PRIESTLEY. BY JAMES YATES, M.A., F.R.S.

1. I COMMENCE these Memorials of Priestley with a notice of the house in which he was born, Field-head, in the parish of Birstal, near Leeds. It was the family house, and was occupied by Dr. Priestley's father and grandfather, and afterwards by his sister, Mrs. Crouch. On the death of her husband in 1786, it appears to have been abandoned by the family as a residence, and, being covered with ivy and much dilapidated, it was lately taken down. It was two stories high, built of stone, and in the ordinary style of the farm-houses and other moderate dwellings in that district. I visited it in the early part of the present century. Its appearance is shewn in a photograph by an amateur artist at Leeds.

PORTRAITS AND ENGRAVINGS FROM THEM.

2. The earliest portrait of Dr. Priestley, photographs from which will be ere long delivered to the subscribers to his statue

at Oxford, is now the property of Mrs. Bilbrough. I first knew this picture, and heard Mrs. Crouch speak of it as the portrait of "her brother Doctor," more than fifty years ago. Mrs. Bilbrough, in a letter from Gildersome, says, "My impression is, that Mrs. Crouch brought her brother's picture along with the old family clock from her father's, Field-head, when she came to live here in 1787." Mr. Crouch having died in 1786, and the family house being abandoned, as above mentioned, his widow went to live with my mother's first cousin, Mr. Hudson, who was a bachelor, and resided in his paternal abode at Gildersome. Here I used to visit him, and saw the picture. It has always hung there in the dining-room with other family portraits. It has been highly valued by its possessors, who have been unwilling to part with it on any terms.

Mr. Hudson used to relate the following story. The picture was once placed in the window of a carver and gilder's shop at Leeds, when the Doctor stopped to look at it in passing by. A woman happened to be doing the same, and, on seeing him, exclaimed, "Why, here's the fellow himself!"

This portrait is carefully painted and well finished. It may be presumed to be a good likeness. The features are the same as in the later portraits, allowance being made for advance in age. It has also the same pleasant expression. The full-bottomed wig is a remarkable distinction. I believe this was the costume of the divinity students, when they left the Academy at Daventry to settle in the ministry. When Dr. Priestley assumed the wig with curls, in which he appears in all the later portraits, I have not been able to ascertain.

Mrs. Bilbrough's maiden name was Ellen Priestley. Her father was Mr. Hudson's first cousin. When the Committee of subscribers to the statue resolved to have the photograph from this portrait executed by Caldesi and Co., I directed that the inscription under it should be "Joseph Priestley, *æt.* 30, from a portrait formerly in the possession of William Hudson, Esq., of Gildersome." The age was inferred from the features, and Mr. Hudson's name added from my own distinct recollection of the former position of the picture in his house.*

3. Portrait belonging to Robert A. Wainewright, Esq., of 24, Compton Terrace, Islington, who married Sarah, daughter of Joseph, eldest son of Dr. Priestley. In this we see the wig with curls, the same in fashion which the Doctor always afterwards wore till he went to America. Painted by I. Millar in 1776 or 1777, i.e. during his connection with the Earl of Shelburne. Mr. Wainewright, in a letter to me, dated Feb. 22, 1860, says, "Dr. Priestley's eldest son, my wife's father, told my wife it was the best likeness of Dr. Priestley he knew, and was a very faith-

* A few copies of this photograph are on sale at Whitfield's, 178, Strand.

ful resemblance." An excellent portrait of Mrs. Priestley, a pendant to this, also belongs to Mr. Wainewright.

4. Portrait now in the possession of Thomas Thornely, Esq., of Liverpool, and formerly of his father. Painted by Peter Holland, formerly of Birmingham, whom I remember as the drawing-master at Mr. Shepherd's school at Gateacre, near Liverpool. Similar in style and character to the last, but not so well executed.

5. Portrait formerly in the possession of Mrs. Judith Mansell, of Birmingham, who was the intimate friend of Dr. Priestley. She bought this portrait in Birmingham soon after the riots of 1791. It had been part of the plunder carried off from Fair Hill, which was his residence. During my residence in Birmingham, I used to see it hanging over the fire-place of the dining-room of Mrs. Mansell's house in Temple Row. The artist was not known, nor was it much valued by the person from whom she bought it. But she and her four sisters, having deliberated upon its proper destination, decided that it would be best to bequeath it to Manchester New College. Since the removal of this institution to London, it has hung in the Library of University Hall, Gordon Square.

6. Portrait by Fuseli, painted for Joseph Johnson, the bookseller, in 1783. At this time Priestley was Joseph Johnson's guest in St. Paul's Churchyard, and was requested to sit for his portrait, that it might remain in the house which he was accustomed to frequent, and in which he enjoyed the society of such men as Fuseli, Opie, Price, Geddes, Wakefield, Aikin and Bonnycastle.* After Johnson's death, the portrait passed into the hands of Mr. John Miles, a relation, at West End, Hampstead. He allowed it to remain in a state of neglect at the top of his house, until, in 1828, Mr. Rowland Hunter, who was Johnson's nephew and successor, persuaded him to give it to Dr. Williams's Trustees. It belongs to them, and is preserved in the Library, 49, Redcross Street.

In this portrait the Doctor is represented in a sitting posture, and partly in profile, nearly all the others being front views. The head is rather thrown back; and a Mr. Cox, still living in Birmingham at the age of 90, who remembers Priestley, says, that he always walked with a quick step, and with his head thrown back, as if looking at the heavens.

Mr. R. Hunter, who often saw Priestley at his uncle's, being then about twenty years old, says this is an excellent likeness. The late Mr. Joseph Priestley thought it "a then marked and strong likeness of his father, but in features rather exaggerated."†

Fuseli's biographer says, "He had a happy method of giving

* See Britton's *Autobiography*, p. 283.

† Private letter from Joseph Parkes, Esq., February, 1860.

from memory likenesses of those persons whose physiognomic cast of countenance took his fancy; but the only portraits which he painted regularly from life, were those of Dr. Priestley and Mrs. Neunham, a niece of Mr. Johnson's. The portrait of Dr. Priestley is very characteristic, and Fuseli always felt convinced that he should have succeeded as a portrait-painter beyond the expectations of his contemporaries, if he had turned his attention to that branch of the art."*

As this is the only portrait of Priestley which contains his whole figure, it has been of great use to the sculptor, Mr. Stephens, in forming his statue.

7. In the year 1835, the Rev. George Kenrick, one of Dr. Williams's Trustees, published a letter, descriptive of this portrait, in the *Christian Reformer*; and in consequence of his subsequent exertions, aided by Richard Taylor, the learned printer, an excellent engraving from it by C. Turner was published in the following year. Only 100 copies were printed.

8. Portrait by Opie, painted at Joseph Johnson's. It belonged to the Rev. Mr. Hole, a Devonshire clergyman, who had been Wakefield's pupil. It subsequently came into the possession of Mr. Barham, of Exeter, and was by him bequeathed to Manchester New College.† It is now preserved with No. 5 in University Hall. Of the mutual regard which subsisted between Dr. Priestley and Mr. Barham, a record is preserved in a letter of the former written in 1791.‡

9. When Dr. Thornton published his splendid work, "Illustrations of the Sexual System of Linnæus" (London, 1801), in which he relates the discoveries of Priestley and Lavoisier in pneumatic chemistry, he employed his engraver, Caldwall, to make a copy from Opie's portrait; and he has placed Priestley above Lavoisier in the same folio plate, as if to indicate Priestley's superiority.

Opie's portrait has little of the mildness and cheerfulness which are conspicuous in all the others except Fuseli's; but it exhibits much more vigour and determination of character, and conveys more the idea of a man of talent and genius. It has been principally followed by Mr. Stephens in the countenance of his statue.

10. Portrait, or miniature, by J. Hazlitt. I only know this from the engraving of it, a copy of which is in the Print-room of the British Museum, and has written under it, "J. Hazlitt, pinxt.," "W. Nutter, sculp.;" also "The Rev. Joseph Priestley, LL.D., F.R.S., &c.; published April 14, 1789, by J. Hazlitt, No. 65, Margaret Street, and sold by R. Cribb, No. 288, High Holborn." So far as I can find, this small neat oval is the earliest engraving of Priestley.

* Knowles's *Life and Writings of Henry Fuseli*, London, 1831, Vol. I. p. 407.

† Private letter from Rev. J. Kenrick, February, 1860.

‡ Rutt's edition of Priestley's Works, Vol. II. p. 112.

11. Portrait by W. Artaud. This artist was a member of Dr. Abraham Rees's congregation in the Old Jewry, and afterwards in Jewin Street. He was much employed by the Dissenters, and his portraits were highly valued. That of Price is well known as a pendant to this of Priestley, in consequence of the engravings of both having been published at the same time and in the same style and size.

This admirable portrait was presented to Dr. Williams's Trustees in 1804, soon after Dr. Priestley's death, and is preserved with No. 6 in the Library, Redcross Street. It was finished just before the Doctor left England. (See Memoirs, Rutt's edition, II. 291, note.)

12. Under the engraving by T. Holloway we read, that it was published "July 15, 1795, and sold by T. Holloway, Newington Green," &c.

13. Drawing in crayons, a profile, looking towards the left hand, executed in America. In this the Doctor appears without his wig, which he ceased to wear when he left England.

14. An engraving from this drawing was published by David Eaton, 187, High Holborn. It is also prefixed to Dr. Priestley's *Notes on Scripture*, in 4 vols. 8vo.

15. Portrait by Gilbert Stewart. This artist was an Englishman of the highest promise. But early in his career, being a drunkard, he left England, and settled in Boston and Philadelphia. His works are rare, and bring high prices, the portrait of Washington giving him a world-wide celebrity. His portrait of Priestley was painted for the Philosophical Society at Philadelphia, of which he had long been a member. The Society had paid Stewart for it. He nevertheless sold it to Mr. Barclay, of Wavertree, near Liverpool, who had gone to America on business, and happened to see the portrait in Stewart's studio. Mr. Barclay had been a hearer of Dr. Priestley at Hackney, and, when he saw the picture, expressed his wish to purchase it. A price being named, he paid it down, and took the picture away. The Society claimed it; but after a correspondence, Mr. Barclay retained his prize, and is still the owner.

Mr. Joseph Parkes, to whom I am indebted for these particulars, and who married Mr. Joseph Priestley's eldest daughter, further says of this most beautiful and interesting portrait,— "My father-in-law, Dr. Priestley's eldest son, always told me, that the above portrait was the best likeness of the Doctor in his advanced old age, especially doing justice to his natural sweetness and placidity of temper, that it was impossible a better likeness could be taken, and especially that this portrait marked the simplicity of expression and manner."

16. About the year 1812, Artaud made two excellent copies of this picture, one of which now belongs to Mr. Joseph Parkes, and the other (17) to his brother-in-law, Mr. Joseph Priestley,

of Northumberland, in Pennsylvania. A small copy (18) was also made for Mr. Charles Knight, the bookseller, which now belongs to Mr. Joseph Parkes.

19. During my residence in Birmingham I called one day on Mr. John Badams, a manufacturing chemist and a clever amateur artist, and saw one of these pictures, together with a very good copy which he had made from it.

It remains that I should mention the two engravings from this portrait.

20. Mr. John Partridge, now portrait-painter to the Queen, made one, which was prefixed by the Rev. R. Aspland to the valuable Memoir of Priestley in the Monthly Repository for 1815. The preceding volume contains an announcement of this "Frontispiece," stating that Stewart's picture was painted in 1803, "was the last for which the Doctor sat," "and was deemed by his son, Mr. Joseph Priestley, and those friends who best knew him, to be the most characteristic and interesting resemblance that exists." Mr. Partridge's engraving was also sold separately.

21. The second engraving is by W. Holl, much superior to the first, and also sold separately. It was made from the "small copy" of Stewart's picture, above mentioned, and for insertion in the Gallery of Portraits, which was published by C. Knight under the superintendence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Lord Brougham has introduced this fine engraving to embellish his account of Priestley in his Lives of Eminent Men of Letters and Science, Lond. 1845, Vol. I. p. 402. The placid and amiable looks of the great philosopher, which were the real index of his mind, supply not a weak answer to the severe and disparaging remarks of the noble biographer, although these remarks were at the time still more fully answered by Mr. William Turner, Jun., in the Christian Reformer.

MEDALLIONS IN TERRA COTTA BY WEDGWOOD, AND ENGRAVINGS FROM THEM.

These medallions in three different sizes shew Priestley's profile, looking towards the right, in white upon a blue ground. They are supposed to be after designs by Flaxman. During the period of Priestley's residence in Cheshire and Lancashire, he was on terms of intimate friendship with Wedgwood and with his partner, Mr. Bentley, of Liverpool. Wedgwood, who, besides his zeal for chemistry as applied to manufactures, was a steady and liberal Dissenter of the same class, befriended Priestley in every possible way, and appears to have bestowed the utmost care on these beautiful medallions.

22. The largest of the three is partly ideal. Instead of a wig, it represents Priestley with natural hair, curled and bushy at the lower part, so as to be something like a wig. The countenance, however, was no doubt taken from the life.

23. The next in size is much more delicately and beautifully wrought. The head, including the bust, is 14·2 centimetres (5 $\frac{5}{8}$ inches) high. In this the Doctor wears his wig with curls, as he appears in all the subsequent portraits. He wears a plain cravat, a shirt without any frill, and a kind of fancy robe instead of a coat with buttons.

This medallion and the last appear to be the earliest likenesses after the oil painting, No. 2. About the year 1765, Wedgwood gave a copy of this (No. 23) to Miss Aikin, then of Warrington, afterwards Mrs. Barbauld, and another to Miss Nicholson, of Liverpool, who, being Miss Aikin's schoolfellow and companion, often visited her at Warrington and knew Dr. Priestley intimately. She considered this medallion as a most excellent likeness. Miss Nicholson married Mr. Boardman, of Liverpool, who was connected in business with Wedgwood and Bentley. She left the medallion to her son James (still living), who carried on the business, and he gave it in 1859 to Mr. Henry Taylor, of London. Mr. James Boardman gave another copy to Thomas Thornely, Esq., of Liverpool, late M.P. for Wolverhampton. I have seen a fourth in the possession of the Rev. R. Brook Aspland, of Hackney, and a fifth belonged to the late Joseph Priestley, Esq., who gave it to his youngest daughter, Mrs. Robert Wainewright.

24. The third of Wedgwood's medallions is much less than the other two. A copy of it was shewn to me by Josiah Parkes, C.E., brother of the above-mentioned Joseph Parkes, who was called Josiah after Wedgwood. His father, Mr. John Parkes, of Warwick, was the intimate friend of Priestley.

25. Mr. Henry Taylor obtained photographs, a little reduced in size, from his copy of Wedgwood's second or middle-sized medallion. He presented copies to me and to other friends.

26. Engraving by Angus, an oval, reduced from the same. Published in C. Forster's "Literary Magazine," No. 41, Poultry, Feb. 1, 1792. Two copies of this engraving may be seen in the highly valuable illustrated copy of Walter Wilson's Dissenting Congregations of the Metropolis, which is preserved in Williams's Library, II. 228, and III. 353.

27. Engraving by Tardieu, seems to be exactly copied from the last, and to have belonged to a French work.

28. Engraving by G. Murray, a profile, looking to the right, and in this agreeing with all the six preceding profiles, but with an ordinary coat instead of the fancy robe.

29. Engraving by W. Bromley, "published by I. Sewell, Cornhill, Jan. 1, 1791," in the European Magazine, with a short account of Priestley. The profile is in a circle, looking towards the left, much reduced in size, and delicately executed. It is from the design of Stothard, who has added under the circle with much elegance two children blowing bubbles of air, and a female

holding a discharger in her right hand, and elevating the chain of a Leyden jar with her left.

30. Profile in an oval, with the name, "Joseph Priestley, LL.D., F.R.S.," above in the oval, and flowers and foliage encircling the frame. Underneath is a collection of electrical apparatus, viz., an electrical machine having a glass cylinder and multiplying-wheel, a conductor, thunder-house, Leyden jar, three books, pair of compasses, palette with brushes, &c. This is a beautiful and tasteful composition, but there is no name of artist or publisher.

31. Profile prefixed to the Life of Priestley, by John Corry, Birmingham, 1804.

32. Profile, looking towards the right, No. 53 in Darton's "Cabinet of Portraits, 58, Holborn Hill, 1822." The engraving rather coarse, but strongly marked. After a record of the birth and death of Priestley, it is added,—"His publications are numerous, and in his mental constitution were united ardour and vivacity of intellect, with placidity and mildness of temper. In the domestic relations of life he was uniformly kind and affectionate. Not malice itself could ever fix a stain on his private conduct, or impeach his integrity. Such was the man who has added one more imperishable name to the illustrious dead of his country."*

The late Mr. Britton, in his Autobiography (Vol. I. p. 286, note), says, that he made a profile of Priestley reading his farewell discourse at Hackney in March, 1794, and that it is among the portraits in the European Magazine. But it is not there. The writer's memory appears to have failed him in this as in some other things.

MEDALS.

33. Bronze medal, diameter 3 centimetres ($1\frac{1}{4}$ inch). A well-executed profile, with the face looking towards the right; round the bust, "Joseph Priestley;" under it, in smaller letters, "S. G. Hancock, F." On the reverse, a rectangular pneumatic trough, with glass jars in the water, on a table, with pincers, hammer, &c., an electrical machine, and other apparatus. Under this apparatus the date **MDCCLXXXIII.**

34, 35. Two medals of large size, one bronze, the other silver, commemorate Priestley's retreat to America. In both the countenance is turned towards the right; features the same as in Halliday's medal, hereafter mentioned, and probably taken from the small bust by Halliday. Under the bust, **PHIPSON, F.** Round the bust, **JOSEPHUS PRIESTLEY.** On the reverse the following inscription :

* This eulogy is taken almost verbatim from Brewster's Encyc. Edin., V. 757, 758.

APR. VIII.
BRITANNIÆ
LITORA LINQUENS
COLUMBIAM ADVENIT
JUNII IV.
MDCCXCIV.

This is surrounded by a circle, with a marginal inscription, which differs in the two medals. In the bronze it is,

MAGNUS CHRISTIANUS PHILOSOPHUS.

In the silver it is the line of Virgil, *Æn.* vi. 546,

I DECUS I NOSTRUM MELIORIBUS UTERE FATIS.

36. Profile resembling Halliday's bust, turned towards the left; under it, HALLIDAY; in the surrounding circle, JOSEPH PRIESTLEY, LL.D., F.R.S., followed by the abbreviated titles of the foreign Academies of which he was a member. The reverse bears the inscription which is on the marble tablet erected to his memory in the New Meeting-house, Birmingham. This medal is in bronze and block tin; its diameter, 5 centimetres.

37. Bronze medal differing from the last as follows: under the head, HALLIDAY, F.; the face larger than in the other, the features and drapery different.

Copies of all these medals are in the British Museum.

SCULPTURES.

38. Small bust by Halliday. I have only seen this in plaster. The artist lived in Birmingham, and was a hearer and warm admirer of Dr. Priestley. He is supposed to have produced an excellent likeness. The costume is the same as in Wedgwood's middle-sized medallion. Perhaps this bust was the authority for the engravings above enumerated equally with the medallion. A copy of this bust is in Williams's Library, having been presented by Mr. W. J. Taylor, the medallist, who in part executed the medal, No. 36.

39. Tablet of white marble, erected in the New Meeting-house, Birmingham, to the memory of Priestley by his congregation soon after his death. The artist was Hollins, except that, as Mr. William Hawkes informs me, the excellent profile under the inscription was by Mr. P. Rowe, "at that time a sculptor of much eminence in London." The inscription was written by the Rev. Dr. Parr, whose skill in epitaphs was renowned. It has often been asked, why the town of Birmingham did not raise a monument to Priestley? Probably those who offered this suggestion were unacquainted with the monument in the New Meeting. His countenance is exhibited in the medallion, and the great, admirable, and attractive features of his mind in still finer lines by means of the inscription. This inscription is generally known by being copied on Halliday's medal, No. 36, and pub-

lished in the original edition of the *Memoirs of Priestley*, Lond. 1807, Vol. II. p. 825, and in Rutt's edition, Vol. II. p. 532.

40. A cast in plaster from the marble medallion at Birmingham is in Williams's Library, and may be obtained from Mr. Peter Hollins, son of the artist.

41. Statue in Caen stone, by E. B. Stephens, of Pimlico. Size of life. Erected in the new Museum at Oxford, as related in the last number of this periodical.

42. Photograph from the statue, by U. E. Wright; a copy to be presented to every subscriber, together with the photograph, see No. 2.

TRINKETS AND SEALS.

43. The trinkets here referred to are about the size of a pocket-watch. I have seen three of them, containing under glass a profile two centimetres high, very delicately moulded in wax, and preserving a good likeness of the philosopher. In these he has bands round his neck, significant of his pastoral office. In all the other works he is without bands, although in the pulpit he always wore them with the gown. Probably these elegant memorials were made for the members of his congregation, especially the young, and may be regarded as tokens of their affection and veneration.

Numerous seals, shewing the head in profile, have been made both in metal and in terra cotta.

ACADEMICAL HONOURS.

44. The Copley Gold Medal, given to Priestley by the Royal Society in 1773. See Weld's *History of the Royal Society*, Vol. II. pp. 51—69. This precious medal is preserved by Robert A. Wainwright, Esq.

45. Diploma from the Imperial Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg, dated in December, 1780, and constituting Priestley a foreign member under the authority of the Empress Catharine II. This diploma is the property of his granddaughter, Miss Catherine Irene Finch. It is very beautiful as a work of art. On each side of the engraved writing is a spiral column, bearing emblematical representations of the arts and sciences in circular discs. The seal of the Academy, stamped with the Imperial Eagle, is enclosed in a box of silver gilt, and attached by silken cords with tassels.

46. "A handsome silver inkstand," presented to Dr. Priestley immediately before "his departure into exile" by W. Frend, Tweddell, Godfrey Higgins, James Losh, Dr. Edwards, Sykes, Northmore, and other "members of the University of Cambridge." See *Memoirs*, edited by Rutt, Vol. II. p. 225. This interesting relic is preserved in Australia by Dr. Priestley's granddaughter, Mrs. Bowen.

PHILOSOPHICAL APPARATUS.

47. When Priestley, after his first settlement at Needham, in Suffolk, attempted in vain to obtain the means of livelihood by giving lectures, he purchased *a pair of globes*. (Memoirs, p. 38; Rutt's edition, I. 41.) These globes still exist. The terrestrial globe (without date) bears the following inscription: "A new and correct Globe of the Earth, together with a View of the General and Coasting Trade, Winds, Monsoons, &c., laid down according to the newest Discoveries and from the most exact Observations. By John Senex, F.R.S. Now made and sold (with very considerable Improvements) by B. Martin, in Fleet Street." The celebrated Benjamin Martin was the principal globe-maker of that day.

When in 1758 Priestley went "to London by sea to save expense" on his way to Nantwich, it appears that he took the globes with him. He used them in his school, and, on his removal to Warrington in 1761, sold them to the Rev. John Houghton, who having completed his theological studies at Glasgow under Principal Leechman, and having first settled at Platt, succeeded Priestley at Nantwich both in his chapel and in his school. He was an assiduous teacher of youth, and pursued that employment at Norwich, with the assistance of his son, the Rev. Pendlebury Houghton. Mr. Henry Dowson having married the daughter of the latter, the globes are in their possession.

48. On Priestley's removal to Nantwich, the improvement in his circumstances enabled him to purchase an electrical machine. His elder scholars were taught to use it in making experiments for the instruction and entertainment of friends and neighbours as well as of themselves. Among these elder scholars was Philip Taylor, or (as Priestley calls him in a letter now before me, April 9th, 1762) Phil Taylor, who followed Priestley to Warrington, and was a favourite pupil. The electrical machine came into his possession, and from him it has descended to the Rev. James Martineau, who was for a short time his colleague in Dublin. It is exactly the same kind of machine as that shewn as the "Common Machine" in the plates to Rees's Cyclopædia, Vol. II., Electricity, plate ix. fig. 11. It has been broken and repaired, and, in making the repairs, a winch has been substituted for the original wheel and pulley, so as to turn the cylinder the wrong way.

49. Another of Priestley's electrical machines, constructed with a globe instead of a cylinder, is now in the collection of philosophical instruments, having an historical value, which belongs to the Royal Society. It is the same which is described and figured in the numerous editions of Priestley's History of Electricity, and of his Familiar Introduction to the Study of Electricity; also in Rees, as above, plate viii. fig. 9, and in Brewster's Edinburgh Encyclopædia. This machine came into

the possession of Dr. Robert Cappe, of York, who at his death in 1802 bequeathed it to his friend and fellow-student, Dr. Bostock. I well remember its arrival at my father's house in Liverpool, as Dr. Bostock and I then lived as brothers under his roof. It was recently repaired and presented to the Royal Society by my nephew, Mr. Bostock, who has taken a very warm interest in the erection of the statue of Priestley, and has acted as Secretary to the Committee.

RUINS.

50. Soon after the riots was published in long quarto a volume, which possesses a deep and melancholy interest, entitled "Views of the Ruins of the principal Houses destroyed during the Riots at Birmingham." It contains eight views, with descriptions both in English and French. The views are drawn by P. H. Witton, Jun., engraved by W. Ellis, and published by Joseph Johnson. The first view shews the New Meeting in ruins; the second, Fair Hill, with Dr. Priestley's laboratory; and the remaining six, the houses of some of the principal Dissenters. The text contains a minute and animated account of the conduct of the mob.

FINAL ABODE.

51. Having commenced this catalogue with Dr. Priestley's birth-place, and noticed his handsome abode near Birmingham, where Dr. Aikin, visiting him in 1784, says, "The great philosopher, with his simple, bland, unaffected manners, contented and happy, and declaring that he had not a wish on earth unsatisfied, gave me infinite delight," I now conclude with a notice of his last residence and his grave.

Mrs. Wainewright has a drawing of his house at Northumberland. It has every appearance of neatness, elegance, and comfort. Its owner has described the surrounding scenery as very beautiful and magnificent. It is satisfactory to know that one of the greatest and best of men, after some very severe trials, was surrounded in the decline of life with all that was necessary to external ease and respectability. His eldest son, whom I had the happiness of knowing intimately and now remember with sentiments of the highest regard, was his companion till the moment when he died. A view of this house is given in the engraved title to the Centenary edition of Priestley's Memoirs, Birmingham, Radclyffes and Co., 1833, 12mo.

52. Dr. Priestley was buried at Northumberland in the same tomb with his energetic and excellent wife and his son Henry, to whom he was fondly attached. Can a drawing of their grave be obtained to close this list of memorials?

"The wish Dr. Priestley had expressed, after surviving an affectionate wife and a highly promising son, was accomplished. He shared their burial-place; and, while the sciences he cultivated are advancing to perfection; while the rights of man, which

he ably vindicated, are successfully asserted; and especially while the scriptural views of Christian theology, which he taught with all the ardour of an apostle, are multiplying their adherents among the serious and the considerate, it may be fairly expected that, in other and distant times, the wise and the virtuous will frequently indulge some grateful recollections beside the grave of Priestley.”*

In compiling the above catalogue, which the Editor of the Christian Reformer has kindly offered to publish, it has been my object to obtain further information, so as to render it still more complete. I also hope to have the engravings, photographs, manuscripts, and other appropriate documents, bound together, that I may finally present them to the Royal Society, or some other public body, to be preserved for the use of posterity, and in honour of so great a philosopher and so eminent an example of Christian piety and virtue.

BIRTH AND DESTINY OF MAN.

O LISTEN to the heavenly call,
Hear what the Scriptures loudly teach,
The infant innocence of each,
The final bliss of all, for all!

In purity our lives begin;
And while through mists and darkness driven,
All sorrow, suffering, shame and sin,
Are discipline to fit for heaven,—
The evil shall be wrought to good,
The good made better, and the best
Alone shall rule, alone shall rest,
Out of the vast vicissitude.

O work the most sublime and sure,
By infinite perfection schemed—
The babe all passionless and pure,
The man eternally redeemed!

Beginning, ending,—each divine,—
Though shadowy clouds may roll between;
God! Thou wilt lift the mortal screen,
And all shall track that course of Thine,
In which the unfolding of the plan
The heaven-illumined eye shall see,
And frail and perishable man
Merge into immortality.

JOHN BOWRING.

* Works, by Rutt, Vol. II. p. 533.

GLIMPSES OF THE HEAVEN THAT LIES ABOUT US.*

SIGNS of vitality, indications also of promise for the future, are to be found in our own recent religious literature. Not that the amount of literary production yielded by the members of our free churches is greater than in other periods, but that a greater proportion of their productions bears the tokens of our theological tendencies, and a very considerable number are direct contributions to the religious culture of the age. In Mr. Poynting's book now before us we are pleased to welcome a work of great originality, exhibiting a wide range of scientific research, and breathing a fervent religious spirit throughout. The plan of the book may be briefly summed up as follows. The Introduction claims to discover a harmony of science, philosophy and theology, in the purpose of the Divine Mind to educate the spirit of man so as to lead him to become a partaker of the Divine Nature. Part I. is called " Seeing with the Imagination." It is composed in the form of a vision with angelic and sacred interlocutors, and opens with the disembodiment of a spirit by death and his introduction to the supersensual state. In this state the soul is gifted with direct perception of the material universe as illumined by the glory and active presence of God. Observing first the person of a surviving friend, he beholds him transfigured, and with the divinely imparted spirit of life visibly flowing through his frame. From this discovery he is further led on by an angelic teacher to hear the voices by which the eternal Love is ever calling to the soul of man through his religious and moral qualities. Thence he is taught to behold the wonders of the cerebral and nervous systems, and the purport of the lower desires and appetites. From the human frame and the human affections, the reader is carried through the varieties of animal and vegetable forms, then to the vision of the atoms or spirits of which the material creation is compounded, and further on to the waves of light and of sound and to the atomic motion which produces heat. Then begin descriptions of the composition of the earth, water, metals and chemical phenomena. After a short return to the economy of the human frame, the vision proceeds to the wonders of terrestrial magnetism, and thence to those of astronomy. Chapter xix. opens the geological history. This the disembodied spirit is ingeniously enabled to read by travelling at once to those remoter parts of space at which the successive primeval appearances of the earth, traversing space only with the speed of light, have just arrived ; and then, by approximating to the earth again, the subsequent series of the history is read from their several points until the seer reaches " the rising of man upon the globe,"

* Glimpses of the Heaven that lies about us. By T. E. Poynting. London—Whitfield. 1860.

“the formation of the masterpiece which should complete and close the drama of creation.” Chapters xxvii. to xxxii. form a sort of theological digression; two of them are devoted to the explanation of a mystical three-ness or trinity, consisting of divine and brotherly love and practical holy energy; one chapter to an idea of the incarnation of Christ as the culminating centre of the divine purpose, and another to the doctrine of reconciliation. Lastly, the history of the human race is described in vision somewhat as the angel Michael discourses to Adam in the eleventh and twelfth books of *Paradise Lost*. The instructions of Christ are enlarged upon, and the post-Christian ages are briefly reviewed. A glimpse of the glories of the earth when the human race shall be sufficiently perfect to see those things which the angels see, closes the First Part of the work before us. Such is a very bald summary of the greater portion of this volume; and as such it is inadequate to convey any idea of the mode in which this vast range of subjects is treated. For this purpose we select an extract from chapter ii. of the First Part. It is a description of what the author calls “the central miracle,” or the inpouring of the divine life into the human soul. In his disembodied state, with senses quickened to perceive the secrets of the heaven about us, he beholds the friend whom he has left mourning at his departure :

“He was truly transfigured to my view. The glory of his spirit shone through the outward frame, and clothed it with its beauty, as the sun shines through a fleecy cloud and clothes it with light.

“But the miracle which met my eye was this: *The living flame of the inmost spirit was supported, like all other things, by the fountain-stream of the Divine glory raining down and up and all around, from the everlasting depths.*

“There is a painting of the Resurrection, by Rubens, in which the Christ is represented as rising from the tomb, and streams of radiance are bursting from his form, illuminating all the space around. So from the form of that dear friend did streams of light appear to extend until they were lost to the eye in the immeasurable distance. Only, as I discerned, the streams were ever travelling *to*, not *from* that radiant form. They were the light-beams of Deity passing into the spirit of my friend, to teach it and to bless it. God’s yearning so cleaves to the beloved soul, that He will never for a moment leave it. He loves to feed it out of his own secret life. He so delights in the work of blessing it and raising it to himself, that he every moment must be at that work. Ah, surely he has made the mother feeding her babe from her own life-streams, and thus finding it ineffably dearer, an emblem of himself! But still more has he made such an emblem of himself the spiritual mother watching over a beloved child, and seeking to feed his inner being from springs of her own soul, seeking to breathe into him all her own best thoughts, to kindle in him all her purest feelings, to make him the image of her purer self. Thus did I see that the Father was seeking to breathe his own thoughts and feelings, his very life, into his children’s spirits, and so make them sharers of his own divine nature,—

one with Him,—growing into His image from glory to glory.”—Pp. 16, 17.

The foregoing extract will perhaps be regarded as merely the amplification of a fanciful and pleasing idea: but the facts of science are treated in a similar manner, as the following extract will shew. It describes the vibrations of light as actually visible among the atoms of space.

“Thus the whole space was filled with the multitudinous quiverings—like the flutterings of so many beamy wings—of the countless atoms. *And I saw that each atom was bright, and its boundless wings or fountain-lines were bright in proportion to their quivering.* And I asked the meaning of this. And the angel answered, ‘Light is but the form under which God himself conceives of his own activity, and therefore it is the form under which he presents this activity to his children spirits. The sense of *Light* is the sense of *Divine activity*. Suppose a human being, with human eyes, now to stand beside us. The atoms of that broad ocean before us, struck by the same rays, are quivering over all the surface. As they quiver, their web of wings or fountain-streams must quiver with them; some of these fountain-lines would pass through the eye, and the quivering would be felt by the sensitive curtain,—the retina hanging at the back of its chamber. We may conceive that curtain as *itself trembling in the light-beam*, like the curtain of a window waving to and fro in the fitful breeze. The telegraphic lines from the curtain to the brain carry in lightning flashes the report of this trembling; the conception of light is awakened in the mind, and the atoms of the sea appear bright and coloured, according to their motion. Thus all this conception is awakened by the Divine activity, and what the eye sees in the atoms and calls Light, is the *intensity of Divine action*. We angels are all eye; our ethereal being is sensitive throughout to every quivering, and hence all objects—since all are in intensest motion under the Divine activity—full of the Divine life—appear to us under the form of light more or less intense. While at the same time, since the wings of every atom in the universe pass through us, we have, as it were, telegraphic lines running to ourselves, telling us of all that is happening throughout the boundless space. As thou wilt find, then, we have only to look into ourselves and decipher the telegraphic signals there, in order to read all that is passing in the material universe. It is this very immensity of knowledge, crowding upon the spirit at once, that makes necessary the body to shield it in its infant existence in the great school of God.”—Pp. 110, 111.

Among so many subjects, all treated more or less in this manner, selection is difficult, though perhaps for our immediate purpose we could not have chosen better. If, however, we separate the scientific element from the seership in so novel a manner mixed up with it, there is much to be said on the felicity with which many natural phenomena are described, and the ingenuity of classification bestowed upon the vegetable and animal kingdoms. In the three chapters called “Ranks of the Cherubim,” there are theoretical descriptions of animals from their lowest to their highest forms, and of plants of every kind, which are vivid

and philosophical. The chemical phenomena appear to us less fortunately treated. For geological descriptions the author quotes Hugh Miller. In the more general treatment of the results of science, it will, we think, be found that where the existing knowledge of any particular branch is sufficiently complete for generalization, there the author has received the fullest information from his angelic instructors. The scientific value and interest attaching to this First Part of the volume before us, must, we fear, be limited to the degree in which the subjects are capable of being treated in the author's peculiar method. Indeed, it may be questioned whether the author's method, notwithstanding the charm which the book may have for general readers, and the deep religious element interwoven with the whole of it, can resist the test of criticism; but before proceeding to any further remarks on this head, we will give an outline of the Second Part, and which is entitled, "Verifying by the Reason." We commence by quoting a passage from the opening chapter.

"I inquired anxiously with myself why the faith of modern days seemed so weak, puny, and unreal, compared to the faith of earlier times, and I found it was that God has made it the law of the human mind that it shall not be able to have any belief deep, real, earnest, unless that belief is in *harmony* with the rest of the mind's convictions and feelings; and I saw that in modern times such a flood of new ideas had been poured upon the mind, that the work of harmonizing our faith with knowledge had become gigantic.

"My first discovery which led me on to all the truths which made my faith possible was that of this law of harmony as the foundation of belief. I saw that it was a wonderful fact that the grand belief announced in the Scriptures, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,' the belief in the *unity* of God, has been made by the Maker of our minds to lie at the very foundation of all our belief and all our knowledge of this universe. There is an instinctive conviction in the human mind that the Mind—or call it whatever we will, *Nature* or *Law*, that shapes and rules the universe, is *one*—one in thought, aim, purpose, and operation. Man is naturally Unitarian here; whatever theories he may hold about *distinctions* in the Godhead, still, as his reason develops, he instinctively falls back on the belief that God is really one; that all that comes out of the Godhead is one great harmony; and thus therefore between all true things, that is, all things which form a part of God's realities, which stand in God's world, there must be harmony; they must all form portions of one great unity. Practically the only way by which we know anything to be *true* is that we find it *harmonizing* with other things which we accept as true; and were it not for this instinctive belief in unity—resting on the unity of God—we should have no power to know anything in this universe: we should be the deaf amid eternal harmonies. Now it would seem that because harmony is the essential law of all God's being,—because He is the great *Reason* (order, method), has he breathed into man two rays of his own reason; the **INTELLECTUAL REASON**, which we call the Reason; and the **MORAL REASON**, which we call the Conscience. He has made the essen-

tial condition of their nature and action—as it is the condition of his own—the belief in and the craving for harmony. They are like two inward senses; they sit as judges; and affirmations, or theories or suppositions come before them for belief as witnesses come before a judge. Whatever affirmations appear to them to be harmonious—to agree with other truth already believed, they accept as true and worthy of belief. Truth indeed is but another word for harmony. To say that a thing is true, is but to say that it is harmonious with, forms a part of God's great harmony. *Our only test of truth is harmony.*"—Pp. 349—351.

The chapter from which our extract is taken proceeds to explain the Newtonian law of philosophizing, identified with Sir Wm. Hamilton's "law of parsimony," whereby we reason from the known to the unknown, accepting as causes such things as are known and are sufficient to explain phenomena. In chapter ii. it is observed that in the divine purpose of the education of the spirits of men a "vera causa" is to be found.

"*Spirit*—spirit inspired with the design of man's Divine education—is a known cause. It is quite sufficient to account for the phenomena of the universe. I am bound by the law of my mind, bound by consistency to be content, and to say, *Spirit* possessed with the purpose of educating minds *is* the cause of the phenomena of the universe. To say that we know nothing about that cause because we have no experience of it from the senses, is surely to lie to ourselves. It is to adopt a method of thought which we should scout in other instances. What should we say, for example, to the scepticism which mocked at our Astronomy, and told us we really know nothing about the causes of the motion of the moon and planets; that we know nothing about the heavenly bodies; except that we see them, specks of light, moving variously in the blue concave? at the scepticism that mocked at our Geology, and told us we know nothing whatever of the causes which operated in ancient times to form the rock and the fossil, that we know only how these things now appear, and that is all? What should we say, in fine, to the scepticism that would pass through all our science, all our philosophy, and thus ruthlessly sweep away all the conclusions that go beyond the evidence of the senses? And yet, unless we are thus prepared to resign the larger portion of that upon which we pride ourselves as our *most certain modern knowledge*, and fall back into the very ignorance of barbarism, we may not say without lying to ourselves,—I must use no softer term, positively *lying* to ourselves,—"We know nothing about any invisible Spiritual Cause of the Universe, and of its phenomena."—Pp. 362, 363.

One of the objects of this chapter is to demonstrate that our ideas of a "law of nature" and our "mechanical conception of the universe" are "spectres of the mind," interfering with our direct knowledge of God, "*the eternal fountain of life and power, a cause quite sufficient to account for the phenomena.*"

Gravitation and Repulsion, and the idea of atoms acted upon by the laws which those terms express, are taken up in the third chapter, and declared to be "*idols of the tribe and of the theatre.*" After explaining the law of gravitation, Mr. Poynting inquires

what is the force which acts by that law ; it has, he says, no limit.

“ The force which at this moment holds my hand down upon the table whilst I write these words stretches through all the unbounded space. This is an awful conclusion, and yet it is inevitable. If this force faded somewhere away, then it would decrease in intensity at a greater ratio than the square of the distance ; but it does not, as far as we have been able to trace it, and therefore we conclude that to decrease according to the square of the distance is its law throughout Infinity ; that is, that it is perfectly infinite and everywhere the same in amount. What was Newton’s discovery as regards the laws of the moon’s dependence on the earth, but simply that the law of the diminution of this intensity of gravity according to the square of the distance, and the *square of the distance only*, extended to the moon ? In all that distance, 240,000 miles from the earth, it had diminished only exactly in that proportion. It diminishes in that proportion throughout the whole extent of the solar system. It keeps this law while we can follow it : how natural to infer that it keeps it in the far regions where we cannot follow it.

“ The Force, and the law by which it acts, are then known. And now we put to ourselves the question, This force, what is it ? Is it some unconscious agent, some plastic nature, some Hylozoe—material soul or life, as Cudworth terms it—which the Creator has set to do his work ? We *know* nothing of any such ethereal yet brute unconscious agent. We have no experience of any such existence. In supposing such a thing apart from God, we are supposing—inventing—a new cause of our own imagining, utterly unlike anything that we have experienced. We do know of God and his existence. Here is a ‘ *Vera Causa*,’ a known cause. It is a cause, too, quite sufficient to account for the Phenomena. It is quite sufficient to account for the lines of force, to suppose that the all-present, all-pervading Will of God acts in these lines, that gravitation is in fact the will of God acting with Physical force (like our will acting with muscular force) towards chosen centres.”—Pp. 375, 376.

The fourth chapter treats of the “ *Eidola*” of the sciences of chemistry and electricity, suggesting that we need not suppose substances to differ in kind, while “ *it is only necessary to suppose, what we know to be fact, that they have different amounts of force.*” Similarly does our author refute the notions of electric and magnetic fluids. Chapter v. examines the “ *idols, light and heat,*” considered as substances ; and chapter vi. the principles of animal and vegetable life. The seventh chapter, called “ *Man the Archetype,*” maintains the proposition that the final purpose for which the Creator works is to impart the divine life to man, and in this our author proposes to discover a “ *vera causa*” to explain the whole intention of creation.

“ *Man’s being is constituted just as it ought to be if it is intended to enable him to know God and share His life ; and man’s history has been just what we might expect, if God is educating him from the nothingness of animalism to angel heights.*”—P. 421.

“Nature is constituted just as we might expect it to be constituted if it be intended to be a series of living pictures to reveal to man that ever-present God, whom to know is to have the divine Life—is Life eternal.”—P. 422.

The closing chapter asserts the harmony of the Scriptures with the educational design of the universe.

“The whole Scripture is the unfolding of the Divine Education. There is in it a beautiful historical succession of developments. It is the gradual approach from the depths of night towards the perfect day. At first, in the patriarchs, we have the faint beams of the dawn, then in the prophets the light still deepens, until at last the sun of righteousness himself arises with healing in his wings.”—P. 431.

We have now given our readers an outline of the contents of a book which may be described as an attempt to build up a natural theology on a new basis; and to discover in the phenomena of the universe the visible presence and operations of the Almighty, his beneficent designs, and the purposes of his love towards the human race. The aim of natural theology is to identify the first cause of the physical universe with the Object of religious thought and worship; and this has hitherto been attempted by the argument from design and the observation of the moral purposes apparent in many parts of the creation. In the instance now under review, it is attempted, in the First Part of the work, to recognize the personal presence and operations of God in the forces visible in the material universe, by viewing the phenomena thereof through the medium of the religious emotions; and, in the Second Part, to substitute the idea of God in the place of the laws which have hitherto been regarded as secondary causes or modes of operation. The method of Mr. Poynting’s First Part is styled by him, as we have already stated, “*Seeing with the Imagination.*” The Second Part lays down the grounds of reason upon which the imagination seeks to build.

In order of production, the author informs us that the Second Part was written first; and it is obvious that this must have been the case. Were our knowledge of phenomena commensurate with our theories, and were we able to discover by intuition instead of by induction, the order which the author has adopted would be just, and the verifications of the reason would follow the perceptions of the higher and more perfect faculty. But, alas for our human limitations!—if, indeed, it be right to deplore the mental conditions imposed by Almighty Wisdom—the direct perception of the eternal designs is not permitted to us: and though we may indulge the imagination with glimpses through the veil of mystery which hangs between our senses and the essential qualities of things, we may not claim for our glimpses the authority of sight: rather must we exercise our reason in that spirit of reliance which will impart to it the nature of a faith by which we may walk. The author, indeed, seems to

have been conscious of this difficulty when he put into the mouth of an angel the teachings of the First Part of his book,—admitting, as it were, that his views of the universe from the sphere of the imagination belong to another condition of being; while in the Second Part his argument rests on the, for us, surer authority of such names as those of Newton, Humboldt or Faraday. We assign, then, to the Second Part the higher value, as a contribution to both science and theology; and moreover we consider it as intrinsically valuable in a very high degree. It is the substantive part of the book, well thought out and well written. The first book is fertile in illustration, and in many parts eloquent as well as ingenious. But we think there is a defect in the method, and that a clue to this defect may be found in the author's employment of the imagination as a faculty for the immediate discovery of scientific truth. There is a broad distinction between the objects of imagination and those which we actually perceive or infer, as there is a radical difference between the function of the imagination and that of the reason. We think Mr. Poynting has somewhat confused these distinctions. The *Divina Commedia* is an imaginative presentation of the unseen world from the religious stand-point of the middle ages; and every great poet has given us glimpses of the higher harmonies of possible existence according with the ideas and knowledge of his age. These poets have the power, in regard to their own particular creations, of seeing with the imagination, and of imparting that power to their readers; but the truth of their imaginings, the possibility of the things imagined, can never be confounded with the results of the reason acting by observation and comparison, although the greatest minds which have added to our knowledge of the universe have occasionally possessed and exercised the power of imagining in anticipation of their discoveries. Mr. Poynting puts imaginative perception and discovery by induction on the same plane, and demands that the direct results should be the same,—as if they were parallel methods, like two modes of working an arithmetical problem. Their results, indeed, must harmonize, in so far as there is a harmony between the possible and the actual, and a consistency in both with the laws of thought and the conditions of being. That imagination may anticipate discovery may be illustrated by the case of Mr. Owen's fossil bird; but in that instance the materials were ready, the direction of the thought limited, and the conditions thus supplied waited only for the intellectual spark which the noble faculty alone could shed. The conditions of Mr. Poynting's ideal world, its laws and its ultimate purposes, are not on the level of observation and certainty, as are the truths of scientific induction and the things which are cognizable by the senses and the reason.

The value of the Second Part is unquestionably to be found

in its searching examination of the theoretic assumptions of the physical sciences. There is something almost startling in the withdrawal of the ideas of attraction and gravitation, &c., which as abstract propositions have been permitted to stand between our consciousness of the presence of God and our observation of physical phenomena, and in the demand upon our acceptance of that presence and His power as a visible cause in the universe by which we are surrounded. A cause efficient indeed, and a *vera causa* which is sufficient, and more than sufficient, to solve all requirements and to bring us to the ultimate analysis. But do we in fact arrive at this ultimate analysis? Is there no hiatus between the processes we perceive and the immediate presence of the Eternal? May there not be an "*eidolon*" in the author's own idea also,—namely, the visibility of the Eternal operation? If our spiritual perceptions were on the same plane as our physical senses, the argument would perhaps be complete. But we cannot assume this to be the case. The *vera causa* which is required to explain phenomena is a postulate of the reason commensurate with our perceptions, and it is no real addition to our knowledge of the lines of force (for instance) to identify the law relating to them especially with the hand of God. Are we not substituting a religious idea for a philosophical formula; and do we in fact gain anything in actual knowledge by placing the religious idea at the remote end of a line of induction? Why suppose the presence of Deity in the ultimate agency more than in the intermediate?—as the first cause, rather than in what are called secondary causes? The glory of Him who covereth Himself with light as with a garment, who stretcheth out the heavens like a curtain, is perceived and adored by the enlightened spirit of man; and no philosophical methods can impair the relations existing between the Heavenly Father and His spiritual children. It is with a deep sense of this truth, and in full sympathy with the lofty spirit of piety which pervades the volume before us, that we raise these questions on Mr. Poynting's argument. He has done a good work in producing so able a book; and he will appreciate our attempt to examine his argument more than any words of commendation which we might have bestowed on the eloquence of his style and the variety of his knowledge.

A CONCESSION.

In the Nicene Creed, that expression, which is so often wrongly read, "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God," means absolutely nothing. There are two statements made there. The first is this, "The Son was God;" the second is this, "The Son was of God," shewing his derivation. And in that we have one of the deepest and most blessed truths of revelation. The Unitarian maintains a divine humanity—a blessed, blessed truth.—*F. W. Robertson.*

THE MIND THAT WAS IN CHRIST.

Philippians ii. 5: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus."

IN these words St. Paul has set before us the very pith and marrow of Christ's religion. Even in the darkest ages of the Church, the necessity of being like Christ was never disputed. There may have been numerous controversies respecting what Christ has said and what Christ has done, but scarcely has there been any difference of opinion respecting what he morally was. Indeed, so life-like is the character of Christ, that the facts of his history which bring before us the *beginning* and *end* of his career are lost sight of, and we think of him as a permanent possession of the world, and still a living presence.

This wonder and admiration is not without danger; it may begin and end in itself, and turn us aside from the great Christian work of becoming ourselves Christ-like. There is not perhaps much danger of a literal imitation of Christ taking place, as the circumstances that surround us are so different. We live not in a land of prophets, where every mountain tells its tale of faithful utterance, and speaks of an integrity and truthfulness that could face a monarch's wrath, and be as unmoved as the rock upon which the prophet planted his foot! We walk not in the solitudes where David sang, nor stand upon the spot where Solomon worshiped! Nor are we lying beneath the shade of Roman greatness, with a tyrant's sceptre speaking to us of a glory departed, and of woes and oppressions yet to come. These were the circumstances that closed around the Jewish Christ, and cut out for him an especial path of duty, and laid upon him the burden of a specific mission. His work, therefore, was his own, was what no one else could do, and of this fact he was ever conscious; and knowing that "the Father had given all things into his hands," it was the great anxiety of his life "to finish the work" which his Father had given him to do. There was a portion of his sorrow he could not tell, there were times when Jesus wept and there was no faithful eye to mark the tear, there were times of travail and struggle when that great soul "trod the wine-press alone."

Jesus might have adopted the language of the ancient prophet and have said, "Come, see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow." A high spiritual development brings a sorrow as profound as its joys are high and lofty, and it is therefore only in a subordinate degree that Christians can suffer with their Lord, or share with him his future glory. Yet the precept has a meaning, "Let the same mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." The essential elements of mind are ever the same; and this applies to devout feelings and impressions and to holy and heavenly purposes, as well as to those which are more earthly and temporary

in their origin, nature and tendency. This idea runs through the apostolic precept, and by it we are taught not to look for the same circumstances as those of Christ, to remember that he was the Master and we are his servants, that he was the Lord and we are the disciples, that he was the Vine and we are the branches, that he was the Shepherd and we are the sheep,—that we are to remember, in fact, where we differ, where we cannot be alike, that we may more successfully occupy the common ground of both, and feel the true bond of our union. That bond is mental; there we are to seek the root of all Christian goodness; and unless we make it our aim that our minds become like Christ's in their essential elements, we have little chance of becoming Christian in the true sense of the word, and our fellowship with the Son of God will be remote and feeble. What is called nearness to Christ can thus only be attained, and without this state of mind it would be a barren privilege to sit on his right hand or on his left in the kingdom of his glory. It was by the state of his mind that Jesus was so near to God, that he was said to "dwell in the bosom of the Father." And it was also a mental condition that separated the Scribes and the Pharisees of that age from the highest spiritual truth, and made them cold, heartless formalists where they might have felt the fire of heavenly love. They paced with Jesus the same temple courts, they looked upon the same holy of holies, they studied the same prophetic lore, they listened to the same temple music as it rolled through Hebrew psalms, and basked in the same serene light of the Sabbath sun, when the quiet hours of the holy day brought rest to the children of toil, to the burdened cattle, and to the exile and wanderer within the Jewish gates. Yet what different results followed! The prophet brought no spiritual insight to the Pharisee, who was busy in studying rubrics and paying tithe; and holy prayer and solemn psalm gave neither the quiet of trust nor the stimulus of aspiration to the quibbling sophists of that day, more anxious to ensnare and perplex than to seek and find the truth, and who found at last in their own sophistry an entangling web that stopped their own progress and cut them off from the freedom of all new developments of truth. How many eyes had looked upon the holy city from the Mount of Olives, but had no tears for its future, because they had neither the anxiety nor the sympathy of love! How many, too, had looked upon the multitude, had marked the popular eye destitute of the fire of intelligence, and had seen how aimless, how totally devoid of purpose was the life of the mass, and yet had no compassion and ministered not to either physical or spiritual wants! Men were hungry and they fed them not, naked and they clothed them not, sick and in prison and they visited them not. Again, there were some who could not be ignorant of the fact that the "priests' lips had ceased to keep knowledge,"

that beneath the sacerdotal vestments there were cold and stony hearts with whom religion was a mere social interest, and had neither the majesty of principle nor the tenderness of sentiment, while rites and ceremonies were followed as so many stage directions, or as the Roman soldier passed through his drill and observed the beat of his march. Yet there was only one spirit that had the courage to face and rebuke these sleepy guardians of a holy trust, and take up their charge where they left it, and do the most important part of their work, instruct the ignorant, reclaim the wanderer, confirm the waverer, comfort the mourner, strengthen the timid, alarm the careless and the sinful, and reprove and admonish the wicked, sometimes with the tone of a tender love, and at others with the thunder of an awful indignation. Now what was the secret force which produced such results? Clearly, in one case there was a mind open to the tenderest impressions, combined with an earnest desire to do battle with the social evils that were shutting men out from the highest good. With the greatest tenderness and gentleness there was a courage which priestly power could not daunt, the firmness which meekness often manifests when it reposes upon what is felt and known to be right and true. The secret source of strength is, in fact, a mind that rests upon something greater than itself, looks for guidance and strength to the highest, is fed, indeed, by the richest of all nurture, and accordingly is courageous and strong.

If, therefore, we would be true followers of Christ, we must make it the leading aim of life to have similar minds. As he studied his *own* times, so must we study *ours*, and be less concerned for the goodness that is *gone* and the vice and sin that is *dead*, than for the pure and virtuous lives that *now* shed their genial light, and the vicious and corrupting elements which spread darkness and wretchedness through nations and churches, and finally through families, till they reach the lonely spirit which thinks its own bitter thoughts and cherishes its own secret serpent that bites and devours. We are talking of Adam's sin, and Abraham's falsehood, and Noah's intemperance, while these evils are living and fresh before us. The liar's utterance might be the last thing we heard, and the drunkard's brawl and degradation the leading fact of yesterday's history.

Now here, surely, it is easy and practical to be Christ-like. The harvests of past times have all been reaped, and the fruitful fields of coming ages will not find idle hands; but look and see your *own* "fields are already white unto the harvest," and labourers are wanted; the vineyard is open still to all who are ready to work; there are blind men crying that they may receive their sight, lepers that would fain wash and be clean, widowed hearts that are open to receive the rich drops of Christian consolation, and there are men sleeping in deeper graves than were ever hewn out of Jewry's rocks, but which may still be recalled to life by

a voice that is charged and intoned with the love of a genuine Christian heart. We need not wander to Ezekiel's valley to find dry bones; and the prophet's God is with *us*, and will hear the same prayer of faith, and clothe our skeletons with beauty, and breathe into them the breath of life.

We cannot doubt there lies before us a Christ-like work, that we have blind men who need light, and sinners that need salvation. Generation after generation is melting away, unblest and unsaved; still there are scorers of the truth and despisers of the cross, fools who say in their hearts there is no God, "rich men who oppress," and poor men "who steal and take the name of the Lord in vain;" and why does the great work remain undone, and what can awaken the Church from the deep sleep into which she has fallen, while sin and death are so busy, and the rank harvest of evil is growing around? The answer to this question is as easy as it is obvious,—for a Christ-like work we must have a Christ-like mind. There must be a faith as large, or we shall stop in the very beginning, when we see how malignant is sin, how deep the sleep into which men have fallen, how wide and profound the spiritual disease that has been transmitting itself age after age, blinding men's intellects, crippling their wills and cankering their very hearts. Here science may well pause and say, "This is not my work." Legislation may enact severer laws, may provide wiser arrangements, and will at best only touch the very surface of the evil.

This deep social malady must be confronted by a more penetrating force—one, too, that can close upon it without fear and without doubt. Where sages and legislators may fail, where worldly wisdom may be baffled and worldly power may be defeated, "the mind which was also in Christ Jesus" will be triumphant, and "the love that is stronger than death" will melt the heart that sin has hardened, and cleanse the soul which vice has polluted.

But there also comes a time to all of us when nature has no more to give, when we shall have plucked her last fruits and seen her last sun set. When we reach the margin of existence in the present world and feel death's cold hand upon us, what then will best fit us for the ordeal through which we must pass? Can the arts rise in their beauty before dying eyes; can science, strong in her victories, loosen the grasp of the last enemy; can the rich man's gold bribe the spoiler, or the powerful man's influence act like a spell upon this remorseless destroyer? We know that here all such strength becomes weakness, and if victory is to be gained, no mere worldly strength must be employed. But if we have "the same mind that was also in Christ Jesus," what shall silence its voice of comfort, what shall eclipse that light which God commanded to shine out of darkness, which hath shined into the Christian heart to give the light of the knowledge

of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ? What can quench the thoughts and aspirations which the present world has never been able to satisfy, or cloud over the hopes that have been brighter than the stars of a dark night? What can still the throbings of the faithful, filial heart that has felt a Father's mercies in sorrows, his wise appointments in afflictions, his chastisement in grief, his purposes in all changes, his bounty in all blessings? To such a mind, life has been the appointed pathway, and death the final gate that opens to the Father's house on high.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN A KENTISH RECTOR AND ONE OF
HIS PARISHIONERS.

SIR,

BEING one of those who cannot approve of the National Church (as it is most inappropriately called), knowing well its exclusive and tyrannical spirit, manifested especially in small towns and rural districts, nor of the presumptuous arrogance of its clergy, who are ever ready to stigmatize all as heretics and irremediably lost who cannot subscribe to their theological dogmas, I shall feel obliged by your giving a space in the Reformer to the following correspondence, which passed between the rector of a small coast-town in Kent and one of his most influential and valuable parishioners, whose orthodoxy was suspected,—a correspondence which I venture to think will neither be uninteresting nor unedifying to your readers.

LIBERTAS.

From Rev. J. M. N.— to George H.—, Esq.

Rectory, —, Feb. 17, 1860.

My dear Sir,—It is not altogether strange or unreasonable that the death of neighbours or parishioners should suggest to my mind the thought, How would it be with this person or that, if he were to die? Die he must (no one can tell how soon); but what preparation is he making for himself after death? Of his property he may have disposal; but what preparation has he made for himself? Now Christianity claims to be the guide for man in all such matters; and (making so great a claim) it must either be a vast imposture, which has beguiled some of the best, the wisest and the most distinguished of men, or it must be a great truth.

You, my dear Sir, evidently, avowedly, do not believe it to be a great truth. Can you prove it to be a great imposture? And may I ask you, in all candour, whether in the retrospect of the past, dating back to the days of your father, or in the prospect of the future, looking forward to that which must come (sooner or later), you can conscientiously feel that your creed (whatever it is) gives you peace and satisfaction? If so, you cannot be offended with me for suggesting a question, the answer

to which in your mind has already been attended with so pleasurable and sincere an emotion as, "I am quite right beyond a doubt." But if (on the contrary) there should be reasonable doubt, let me ask you as a favour to consider and weigh it, until you can give yourself some more satisfactory answer to the thought, "I am a dying man—what will become of me after death?" May I ask you to peruse the accompanying volume (Rawlinson's Bampton Lectures)? I was in the act of reading it, and have not yet finished it, when the thought of writing to you occurred to me. It is written by one of the greatest scholars of the day. The argument can only be refuted by proving that Christianity is based upon an historical lie; and if so, how is the fact of its existence to be accounted for? The invention of the whole as a fiction is more extraordinary and incredible than the admission of it as a fact. My excuse for writing thus to you must be, that I believe myself to be right in the opinion that Christianity is an incontrovertible *truth*.

Supposing (as a mere hypothesis) that *I* have been foolishly deluded, what shall I be the worse for my credulity? If (on the other hand) *you* believe your opinions to be incontrovertibly true, and supposing (as an hypothesis) that you are wrong, what will *you* be the worse for your unbelief?

My error (according to your showing) would be comparatively harmless; your error (according to the state of the case) would be most dangerous. I hope you will not think of me as the worse friend for having written thus plainly. As a physician of the soul, I believe you in great danger.

Yours sincerely,

J. M. N.—.

From G. H—, Esq., to Rev. J. M. N.—.

U. D., Feb. 19, 1860.

My dear Sir,—To reply in a full and satisfactory manner to your note of yesterday, would involve an amount of controversy which would be as tiresome to you to peruse as it would be irksome to me to engage in. I shall therefore be as brief as possible, and confine myself to the topics introduced by yourself.

You address yourself to me as "a physician of the soul, believing me in great danger." I do not quarrel with you for entertaining this view; but I submit that your style of accosting your patient is singularly infelicitous, and that you have made a very inaccurate diagnosis of the disease. You imagine me to disclaim Christianity as a "guide for man in making preparation for himself after death," as rejecting it as "a vast imposture," "evidently and avowedly not believing it to be a great truth." Now I never had but one conversation with you on the subject, and I am quite sure no such sentiments escaped my lips; and if any one has informed you that I have indulged or expressed such views, he has practised upon your credulity.

The head and front of my offending is, that I exercise the right, early inculcated upon me as a duty, and assumed by Protestants of every persuasion, of estimating for myself what is the essence of Christianity. I find a dozen schemes, each differing from the other,—even the same Church propounding conflicting articles in different parts of its services; I find these schemes severally upheld with equal learning, with equal tenacity, and, I am sorry to say, with equal intemperance; and I am

forced to do, what I believe every man of reflection does, either covertly or overtly, i.e. to frame for myself, as best I may, out of this chaotic and contradictory mass, what I must call, for want of a better name, an *eclectio Christianity*.

It is very possible that in this process I may discard elements which to you appear essential, just as your essentials may appear to me mere dross or scum. But while I hold all authoritative text-built systems of theology in the most perfect contempt, I have never entertained a thought or spoken a word in disparagement or irreverence of Christianity or religion. I often, indeed, wonder, and always feel thankful, that I have not fallen into complete scepticism; for it has been my misfortune to read a great deal of acrimonious controversy, and I have found that positiveness of assertion and censure of opponents have always been in the inverse ratio of the probability and reasonableness of the doctrines at issue.

You ask me if "my creed, whatever it is, gives me peace and satisfaction." May I ask, in return, whether you mean to infer that the proper *test* of the truth of any doctrine is the peace and satisfaction which it yields? I presume you hold the doctrine of the eternal punishment of millions of souls in hell. Is it impertinent to inquire what amount of peace and satisfaction you derive from this awful view of Divine vengeance? On the other hand, the Catholic believes in purgatory, penance and the intercession of saints—all *true doctrines*, if judged by the degree of comfort they afford to the pious worshiper. But without adverting further to the logic of the matter, it may be professional, but it is very unfair, to menace a man with endless reprobation on the ground of his speculative religious opinions, and in the same breath to inquire, "How do you feel yourself now?" To suggest, or rather to assure a man, ex cathedrâ, that he is a lost soul, and to expect that he will receive the announcement with unruffled composure, is contrary to all psychological experience; but to interpret that transient emotion of uneasiness as a smiting of conscience and as a practical renunciation of his principles, is a combined act of ignorance and injustice.

I know it is a part of the treatment recognized by the orthodox physician of the soul in the case of all who deviate from the prescribed routine of thought, to keep such, if possible, under a continual blister; and the unhappy patient is taught in numberless ways that the penalties of his recusancy, although they are to be continued by the Almighty in another world, are to be commenced by his fellow-men in the present one. But to give a direct and decisive answer to your question, "Does my creed, whatever it is, give me peace and satisfaction?" I can truly and sincerely say that it does. The "retrospect of the past" does, I confess, often bring back the dark shadow of many an action which I cannot review without grief and mortification. On that score no one can be a severer judge than I am myself. But I have never yet felt a pang of conscience for errors of religious belief. The *acts* of my life were voluntary; the good and the bad were open to my choice; but intellectual decisions are obedient to no control but that of stern reason, and it is a perversion of all the moral sentiments to classify errors of the intellect with deliberate and wilful sins.

It would be prolix to explain the links of connection between my creed and my happiness; I will simply say that *your* solution of the

phenomenon, “that it results from the pleasurable emotion that I am quite right beyond a doubt,” is altogether without foundation. I utterly disclaim any such conceit. I am so thoroughly convinced that I see only in part and know only in part, and that, with a very limited range of faculty, I am called upon to form some opinion on subjects of the most profound significancy, that I estimate my decision at a very low value; indeed, its only value to me is, that it is the best I can form after an unbiassed and not uncareful investigation. But while I embrace what appears to me the truth with firmness, I cast no reflection and impute no blame on those who arrive at the most contrary conclusions. That “every one should be fully persuaded in his own mind” is a most wholesome suggestion, and may be extended with advantage to all questions, both of philosophy and theology.

You speak as if a man could make or unmake his belief at pleasure, and that as it can be shewn that his safety lies in believing in a certain manner, his sense of self-interest ought at once to decide the direction of his belief. I cannot explain the constitution and action of other minds; but I find it impossible, in my own case, to reverse the judgments of my conscience for any bribe, present or future. I can indeed assume an external profession and act the part of a conformist; but you would be the last man to recommend a duplicity which old Homer could reprove:

“Who dares think one thing and another tell,
My soul abhors him as the gates of hell.”

In direct opposition to your view, it has been well said, that “no inquirer after truth can fix thereon a direct and clear-sighted gaze, who is casting side-glances all the while on the prospect of his soul.”

I have already exceeded my proposed limits. I will only allude to what appears to me the weak logic of one of your sentences. You say, “the fact of Christianity proves its truth.” How will you dispose of the Mahometan religion, of Buddhism, and of other wide-spread superstitions?

In conclusion, I beg to say that I take no offence at your addressing me as you have done. I think you vastly mistaken; but I certainly do not reciprocate your alarm, any more than I should do if you blundered in a mathematical demonstration. And as you have lent me a book for my guidance, perhaps you will allow me to recommend the perusal of the accompanying volume (Martineau’s *Rationale of Religious Inquiry*), which has given me much pleasure and instruction.

I am, &c. &c.,
G. H.

IGNORANT INFALLIBILITY.

MEN generally find it most easy to explain everything who are ignorant of everything.—*Sir H. Davy.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

REV. WILLIAM HINCKS AND MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

SIR,

MR. HINCKS' letter in your last number renders necessary a few words from me. I never saw the statement by Mr. Kenrick in which Mr. Hincks' name is mentioned until it appeared in print, but my own recollection of the facts is entirely in accordance with the account given by Mr. Kenrick.

All the correspondence upon the subject of Mr. Hincks' resignation passed through my hands. I was also present at all meetings of the College Committee, and the minutes of proceedings of the Committee were made by me or under my immediate superintendence. Probably, therefore, I have better means than Mr. Hincks possessed of knowing the circumstances under which the removal of the College from York took place. Mr. Hincks' resignation certainly was founded, in his correspondence with the Committee, upon dissatisfaction with his pecuniary position at York, which had been the subject of voluminous correspondence for years previously; and his determination to resign upon that ground had been two or three times previously expressed and subsequently withdrawn. I have not the least hesitation in saying that Mr. Hincks' avowed dissatisfaction with his position hastened the removal of the College from York, and closed Mr. Wellbeloved's connection with the Institution at an earlier period than would otherwise have been the case. In fact, Mr. Hincks' retirement, before any decision as to the future locality or position of the College had been in any way arrived at, placed the Committee in a position of considerable difficulty, and obliged them to make a temporary arrangement with the Rev. J. H. Ryland for carrying on the domestic establishment at York for one year after Mr. Hincks' departure.

I have no wish to revive any controversy on the subject with my old friend and tutor, but his denial of the correctness of Mr. Kenrick's statement obliges me to bear my testimony to its accuracy. Mr. Hincks' known dissatisfaction with his position at York had led to discussion as to what future arrangements might be desirable; but he is mistaken in supposing that any decision as to a removal had been formed until his own resignation rendered a consideration of the question necessary, and precipitated Mr. Wellbeloved's retirement.

WM. RAYNER WOOD.

Singleton, Manchester, Aug. 3, 1860.

ON NATURAL DEPRAVITY.

SIR,

I do not think Mr. Hinton has succeeded better than other deep thinkers who have gone before him in the solution of that mystery of mysteries, Natural Depravity. When, indeed, he says that there is a principle within us which is by nature prone to sin and to estrangement from God, he states what I take to be a very evident truth. I do not

suppose that any one can deny that such is the case ; the expression that we so often make use of, "the weakness of the flesh," is but another name for the same thing. There is that connected with the flesh and the world which tends to draw us away from God, something which requires always to be opposed with great effort, which makes the approach to God difficult, which renders the way to heaven, even for the innocent such as Jesus, a road of toil and suffering and beset by snares on every hand.

Mr. Hinton, I believe, considers that man may have been originally created with this tendency towards evil, instead of, as the so-called orthodox Christians hold, being at first created of a nature pure and in harmony with God, but which became depraved afterwards. I think, however, that there is more in this question of the time at which depravity commenced than Mr. Hinton imagines, for it at once involves another question of the very first interest: if he says that man was originally endowed with a disposition inclining to sin, then he must mean that he was so endowed by the hand of his Creator. But if this be his meaning, I think he must not be surprised if he finds that many of his fellow-christians cannot give him their assent, for there are many simple-minded believers who cannot look upon God as ever endowing man with what would tend to bring about estrangement from Himself; on the contrary, they can only regard Him as always seeking to draw man nearer to Himself,—nay, as having ever been the bitter opponent of this disposition to sin, as pleading with us against it, as seeking to smooth our way through it, "as fighting for us."

But Mr. Hinton says, that "this proneness [to sin] is the *natural consequence* of man's fallible endowments," and that "he *could not be otherwise* endowed." I do not think by regarding the difficulty in this way he yet acquires any logical advantage, for this is simply to say that God was necessitated to make human nature impure and inclining to sin, so that the Omnipotent had to submit to necessity, which is a contradiction.

On the other hand, the Trinitarians believe that when man was first made, human nature was pure and good, as all that comes from the hand of God must be; that afterwards he sinned, in consequence of which his nature became depraved as it now is; but that the influence that brought about this depravity was not from God, but from a power that works in opposition to God. Granting thus much, I think that what follows is not altogether without reason: if you have, on the one hand, a kind and loving Father, and, on the other hand, his children who have wandered away from Him, and who now, if they would return to Him again, can only do so by passing through a life of continued struggle and much suffering, they say that God, seeing our condition, took such pity upon us that He entered into our fallen nature Himself, He became man that He too might bear our burdens and so make them lighter for us, that he might take up the cross Himself and go before, in order to lead us back to the heaven from which we have wandered.

I do not want to be considered as pleading the cause of Trinitarianism in general; I could not ever do so; but I have only endeavoured here to give something of the rationale of Trinitarianism where I conceive it comes in contact with Mr. Hinton's views. He has advanced some views upon natural depravity which he considers might be capable of

reconciling those of the Unitarian and orthodox Christians on that subject; he invites discussion from your readers; with your kind permission, therefore, I would give some reasons why it appears to me that, as far as the orthodox Christians are concerned, he is hardly likely to gain their consent.

FIDES.

PETER AND CEPHAS.

SIR,

YOUR correspondent *Peter* cannot expect his theory to be accepted without one line of argument offered in its behalf,—the theory that Cephas whom St. Paul “withstood to the face” was not Cephas or Peter the apostle, but “an heretical Cephas.” I never read this opinion before; and he who starts it should at least say what he can in its defence. Can we imagine that Paul (Gal. i. 18) went up to Jerusalem to see Cephas the heretic? What would this be to his argument, that he had not at first conferred with “flesh and blood,” or derived his commission from those who “seemed to be somewhat”? And how comes this heretical Cephas to be enumerated with James and John (Gal. ii. 9) among “the pillars” of the church?

Your correspondent seems to imply that Conybeare and Howson favour his idea by reading *Cephas* instead of *Peter* in the former instance. But they preclude his fancy by their note on this very passage, as follows:

“*Cephas*, not *Peter*, is the reading of the best MSS. throughout this Epistle, as well as in the Epistles to Corinth, except in one passage, Gal. ii. 7, 8. St. Peter was ordinarily known up to this period by the Syro-Chaldaic form of his name (the name actually given by our Lord), and not by its Greek equivalent. It is remarkable that he himself, in his Epistles, uses the Greek form, perhaps as a mark of his antagonism to the Judaizers, who naturally would cling to the Hebraic form.” (Note on Gal. i. 18.)

It was scarcely candid to quote Conybeare and Howson as the basis of the theory.

Then how does St. Paul’s expostulation to the Corinthians run, on this new theory? “Every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas (the heretic), and I of Christ.” Does your correspondent imply that Paul regarded the name of Apollos as heretical too? Or were they all names of true apostles and preachers, wrongly taken as party names? (1 Cor. i. 12).

We shall perhaps next hear that Saul the Jew was a different person from Paul the apostle; and Didymus, a heretic, sometimes wrongly taken for Thomas the apostle; and that the Boanerges (the sons of thunder) were different from the apostles James and John who one day proposed to call down fire from heaven on the Samaritans.

If your “Peter’s” suggestion is not a mere whim, he will perhaps defend it as an opinion.

THE WRITER ON “PETER AND PAUL, THEIR ALLEGED DIFFERENCES.”

Having lent your August No., I refer to “Peter’s” conjecture by memory only.

[We have received from our correspondent “Peter” his promised “Pauline History of Cephas.”—ED. C. R.]

CRITICAL NOTICES.

University Education in England for Natives of India, &c. By Hodgson Pratt, B.C.S. 8vo. Pp. 36. Ridgway. 1860.

THE line of demarcation or separation which divides the natives from the Europeans in British India, is alike the blot and the embarrassment of the public administration of affairs in those vast regions. The conquerors found an all-pervading curse, the curse of *caste*, with its multitudinous miseries and mischiefs, among the coloured races, and they added to it a new element,—the distinction between the dark-serving many and the white-ruling few. Equality in the eye of the law is the best evidence of good government; fraternity in the recognition of public opinion is the most satisfactory test of social progress and civilization. But the fact of *equality* and the *sentiment* of fraternity are equally wanting in India. Can they be supplied?—for until the barriers are weakened or broken down little indeed shall we advance in the way of political improvement.

Mr. Pratt brings his valuable contribution in aid of this great object. The authorities he quotes are overwhelming as to the existence and magnitude of the grievance and the necessity of its redress; and if Mr. Pratt had only collected the appendix of the *dicta* of enlightened men, he would have rendered an important service to the cause he seeks to promote. Some of the most eminent speak out boldly, and declare that we ought ever to look to the grand object of training and qualifying the natives for *self-government*. That, no doubt, is our highest and noblest mission; and if it be kept constantly and steadily in view, we shall not be led far astray.

The scheme of Mr. Pratt is simple and intelligible. He would invite the natives into the field of competition, and encourage and assist them to enter fairly and hopefully upon educational rivalry. He avoids details, but asks for the aid and counsels of those who concur in the general object, which he thinks may be best carried out by an Association, to be organized in England, and to seek co-operation from Europeans and natives at the Presidency towns in India. He looks to University education in Great Britain as the most promising means for giving effect to his views, and thinks the University of London as the seat of instruction presents the greatest amount of recommendation. He estimates the expense of student life in the metropolis at £200 a-year, and proposes that one-half be provided by the Association, and the other by “the friends of promising young men in India,” to whom the Association would stand *in loco parentis*.

He does not conceal the difficulties which are presented by the social organization in India. At first it might not be easy to find appropriate candidates willing to break the bondage of *caste*, to migrate to foreign lands, to place themselves under the control of the proposed Association. But a few would present themselves, and the good fortune of the few would encourage the ambition of the many. May success attend Mr. Pratt's honourable and honouring purposes! They are well timed; they are earnestly and ably advocated.

We must find room for two extracts as specimens of the able way in which Mr. Hodgson Pratt discusses his subject. The first extract bears

on a topic of no little interest to the Unitarian body at the present time, in connection with the Transylvanians now invited over by the Unitarian Association and other bodies to come and study in our colleges and to imbibe the free and healthful spirit of English manners :

“ What then is to be done ? I propose that measures should be adopted for bringing to this country every year a small number of young natives of superior capacity, for the purpose of giving them a university education and the influences of English life and society. They would be men who had already completed the rudimentary part of their education in our Indian schools and colleges, and who would be ready at once to enter upon the special studies requisite for the learned Professions, the Bar, Medicine, or Divinity, as well as for Civil Engineering, while some might devote their time to the study of Commerce and Manufactures. They would, before leaving India, have received such an education as would enable them at once, on their arrival in England, to derive benefit from cultivated English society and from travel, as well as from lectures and public institutions. It will be said by objectors that there are already Universities in India by which the natives are enabled to enter upon the profession of medicine, law, or civil engineering. That is true, but what I desire to point out is that education in India is merely the education of the lecture-room, and what I want is the education of English life out of the lecture-room. In England, natives of India would have not only a higher kind of competition than in their own country, where their class-fellows are men of their own race and standing; not only the higher teaching of an English University as compared with that of a Colony; not only the higher standard of attainment so requisite; but,—what I would chiefly lay stress upon,—the free association with professors and fellow-students, with the first minds in the world.”—Pp. 21, 22.

The other extract we make explains Mr. Hodgson Pratt’s views of the forbearance due from Christians to Hindoos who may so far conquer the prejudices of caste and religion as to come over to us :

“ I purposely say nothing as to Religion. These will be men who can judge for themselves and will occupy a position which should secure them from any impertinent attempts at propagandism. People who would resort to interference in this respect can have but little faith in God, or in the indirect testimony to the origin of our religion, which is afforded by the whole aspect of European society as contrasted with that of the East. Any misplaced and short-sighted interference in this matter would probably deter others from coming and neutralize the whole scheme. It should be considered a point of honour to leave these men to be perfectly free agents in the formation of their own conclusions on this as well as on all other points.”—P. 24.

The Morals of Belief: a Letter to the Churches of the Western Unitarian Christian Union, read before their Half-yearly Meeting, held at Bridport, Wednesday, May 23rd, 1860. By Edward Higginson, of Swansea. 8vo. Pp. 24. London—Whitfield.

THE recent custom of our Western churches of having, in addition to a Sermon, a Letter at one of their half-yearly meetings, “ with reference to the wants of the body or the circumstances of the times,” would seem to indicate the consciousness on the part of our friends in the West of large intellectual and spiritual resources on the one hand, and vigorous spiritual digestion on the other. It is, with a variation, a revival of the old Puritan practice of a double lecture. The theory of a Letter as distinguished from a Sermon we suppose to be, that to the former a greater latitude is given in topic and illustration than, by some at least

amongst us, would be thought suitable in a pulpit address. Practically, we fear that the arrangement will lead to a waste of power. Englishmen seldom attend to two subjects at once. The clever Letter will, we imagine, push the Sermon to the wall, or the powerful Sermon will make the members of the Union forget the Letter. If, indeed, as might be the case, the Letter were prepared by one of the accomplished and thoughtful laymen who are the strength and ornament of our churches, we should see advantages that would more than compensate for the inconvenience of the system of riding double. Perhaps the hint may be adopted, and at future meetings of the Western Union carefully-prepared addresses may be procured which shall illustrate the lay as well as the clerical aspect of the great religious topics of the day. We would put ourselves to some inconvenience to listen to a Lay Sermon or a Pastoral Letter from Sir John Bowring, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. George Long, Mr. E. W. Field, Dr. William Carpenter, and other able laymen amongst us, whose voices we hear less frequently than we desire. Certain we are that our ministers would gladly welcome such coadjutors into the field.

We are happy in the opportunity of making these remarks when they cannot be supposed to have a personal application. All who were hearers of the sermon at Bridport spoke its praises; and no one who reads this Letter will regret that the intellectual and spiritual banquet provided for the guests on that occasion was so various and rich.

There has been so much criticism on ourselves and our deficiencies, and the result has been so considerable an amount of one-sided statement, that Mr. Higginson shewed great practical wisdom in selecting for his Letter a subject which necessitated a large and comprehensive view of spiritual and ecclesiastical relations. His first remarks in explanation of his selected subject hit the capital blot of too many churches.

“THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF BELIEF AND CONVICTION is wholly overlooked and unheeded by the world in general, and ignored by the religious world in particular. Amid all the religious zeal, the earnest proselytism, the undoubted spiritual life, and the self-denying exertions of churches and individuals, the philosophy of opinions is totally repudiated, the morality of belief, unbelief, and various belief, is slighted and trampled in the dust. There is, in fact, little real, sound, deep belief amid the clamorous demand for it;—there is little, comparatively, that deserves the name of belief, if belief includes intelligent personal conviction. There are prejudices; there are notions; there are impressions, fancies, feelings, all calling themselves beliefs; there are dogmas, there are creeds, there are traditions; there are earnest exhortations to believe, and as earnest denunciations against the sin or danger of doubting or disbelieving; there is what calls itself the assurance of faith, and what believes itself to be the special doctrinal suggestion of the Holy Spirit; but how little is there that can be called clear and intelligent individual conviction!”—Pp. 5, 6.

Mr. Higginson condenses the true philosophy of opinions into these five propositions:

“I. That opinions, to be worth calling opinions, ought to be transparently sincere; and, for the sake of sincerity, their profession should be unmixed with worldly considerations and unbiassed by worldly interests.—II. That they should be the result of intelligent personal inquiry and conviction.—III. That they be held without any implied sense of spiritual merit for holding them, or penal threat of spiritual danger for rejecting them.—IV. That they be avowed and followed out in practice.

"By the first rule we stipulate for the *reality* of opinions; by the second, for their *active mindedness* and prevailing *rationality*; by the third, for their *breadth or liberality*; and by the fourth, for their *practical application*. And, under these self-evident conditions of philosophy and good morals, it follows as a fifth principle,—V. That the particular belief resulting cannot be essential to any one's spiritual safety; and that salvation by a particular creed is a cruel and immoral notion."—Pp. 6, 7.

In a series of vigorous remarks, our author shews most clearly that the true ethics of belief are impugned by *Conformity* to a Church which demands the profession and acceptance of very many controverted propositions; by the pretensions of *Orthodoxy*, which makes mere matters of opinion essential elements of individual salvation; and also by that *False Liberalism* which says it matters not what opinions a man professes or holds.

With the pencil of a master, Mr. Higginson sketches in bold outline the several parties in the Church of England, viz., 1, the High Church party, with its firm retention of ceremony and its opposition to individual judgment; 2, the Evangelical Church party, with its moderate sacerdotal claims and orthodox rigour of doctrine; 3, the Broad Church party, which begins by accepting a narrow creed, and then applies to it a lax belief and a broad system of interpretation. In the delineation of the Dissenting communities, Mr. Higginson is less striking. He wanted for an efficient picture here a broader canvas than he allowed himself. We will honestly confess we could have spared the details he has given us of the despicable arts of the mountebanks and clowns who make the pulpit their stage, and are most successful when they set the assembled worshipers on the grin.

We should have preferred the total omission of his sketch of "the funny pulpit," in order that attention might have been better given to his admirable remarks on the *Non-sectarian* and *Philosophical* Church, and that he might have felt himself at liberty to amplify his remarks upon this interesting portion of his subject.

"Another movement of our day is the, so-called, *Non-sectarian Church*—which yet cannot help being a sect just as much as any other, for it dissents from the Establishment, and again separates from all those who profess Trinitarianism, and also from those who profess Unitarianism, while apparently desiring 'the distinction of having nothing distinctive about it.' Yet it is practically Unitarian all the while, being Christian and not Orthodox. In some cases it escapes the stigma of that unpopular name; and its leaders are much given to the admiration of those *Broad-churchmen* whose beliefs are perhaps as vague as theirs, but whose principle of action is quite different, as it permits them to eat the Church's bread while denying her dogmas. I presume to judge no man's conscience by my own. I only say, this movement for an unsectarian Church, so far as it reaches, tends to confuse the philosophy and morals of belief and opinions, instead of helping to clear them.

"The 'Philosophical' school of religious thought—if we must for a moment (which I do not willingly) yield that name for the mere sake of description—appears to me to lie under the same imputation of neglecting the high morals, if not also confounding the clear logic, of opinion (religious opinion especially) both in its constant eulogies upon the hollow theology of the 'Broad-church' clergy, and also in its own mode of treating questions of Christian evidences, Christian inspiration, and scriptural authority and credibility. All these questions ought indeed to be philosophically discussed; and the honest rejecter of the Christian religion, if he remain a good and religious man, would, of course, always have our manly respect and approval. But we

find such novel meanings attaching themselves insidiously to the well-understood words *natural* and *supernatural*, as to confuse instead of clearing the question of the Gospel miracles;—*Inspiration* has been so described as to be distinctive of no man, though being applied to every man;—scriptural facts have been gnosticised into inward beliefs, and the antiquity and trustworthiness of the Gospel and Apostolic histories been studiously set so low, in defiance of the most ancient testimonies, that it seems difficult, on these views, to know whether we have an historical Christianity or not. Yet descriptive terms should have a meaning; and, the claims of meritorious or safe belief being once repudiated, it should be easy for Philosophy, Natural Religion and the Gospel to hold their own respectively.”—Pp. 20, 21.

We believe with Mr. Higginson that it is the function of the Unitarian Church to teach the world a true morality in respect to the ethics of belief. We may not have applied our own principles correctly in every instance, we may have failed in reaching some important doctrine, but that we have in free inquiry and open profession of opinion the best possible theological apparatus, and that the final result will be TRUTH, we cannot doubt.

So highly do we appreciate the general justness and the vigour of Mr. Higginson’s remarks, that we wish his Letter could become a pastoral to churches in the north, the south and the east, as well as to those in the west.

The Present Relations of Science to Religion. A Sermon preached on Act Sunday, July 1, 1860, before the University of Oxford, during the Meeting of the British Association. By the Rev. Frederick Temple, D.D., Head Master of Rugby School. Printed by request. Pp. 18. Oxford and London—Parker. 1860.

Nor often is it the lot of a minister of religion to address a more remarkable or highly cultivated audience than that which assembled on the 1st of July in St. Mary’s at Oxford. In addition to the Vice-Chancellor and other members of the University, most of the illustrious men whom the British Association had congregated in Oxford were there. There were also there probably not less than a hundred clergymen and other ministers of religion. After the morning prayers were read, with a slovenly indifference, by the clergyman of the day, Dr. Temple, the accomplished Master of Rugby, ascended the pulpit. The bidding prayer, in which he commemorated departed University founders, and especially them of Balliol College (a piece of ecclesiastical barbarism worthy of the middle ages), was a strange introduction to the thoughtful, bold and masterly discourse which is now before us, “printed by request.” He paid a becoming compliment to his audience by taking as the subject of his sermon the Relations of Religion and Science, having especially in his view the changes which science is producing in them.

“Science has been called the handmaid of theology, and theology has often had recourse to science for arguments to prove or confirm her fundamental propositions. But it is remarkable that theology has almost always for this purpose dwelt chiefly not on the scientific, but on the unscientific statements of science. Arguments have been commonly extracted not from the revelations of science, but from her confessions; and theology has begun where science has ended.”—P. 6.

Dr. Temple puts himself in direct opposition to the fashionable spiritual school, who treat the supremacy of Law in creation and nature as

an irreligious and dangerous theory. He vindicates the principle of Law, to which all scientific analogy points, from the charge of tending to Pantheism. He shews, by a train of reasoning beautifully clear, that the fixed laws of nature revealed by science not only supply numberless illustrations of the attributes of God, but also "suggest the analogy by which we can rise above themselves to that higher law" in which we see the presence of a personal God.

Never in our hearing has the subject of the relation which exists between revelation and science been treated by a clergyman of the English Church more boldly, or with a courage more truly wise, than by Dr. Temple on this occasion :

"There was a time when the spheres of these two were distinct; or, if there were ever an appearance of collision, science was required to give place. That time ceased with Galileo, and can never return. The student of science now feels himself bound by the interests of truth, and can admit no other obligation. And if he be a religious man, he believes that both books, the book of Nature and the book of Revelation, come alike from God, and that he has no more right to refuse to accept what he finds in the one than what he finds in the other. The two books are indeed on totally different subjects; the one may be called a treatise on physics and mathematics, the other a treatise on theology and morals. But they are both by the same Author; and the difference in their importance is derived from the difference in their matter, and not from any difference in their authority. Whenever, therefore, there is a collision between them, the dispute becomes simply a question of evidence. Here, you have in nature God's handiwork; there, you have in the Bible the message which He commissioned certain servants of His to give you. They do not appear to agree. Now, on the one side, are you quite certain in your interpretation of His handiwork? on the other, are you quite certain that you are not mixing up with His message some extraneous matter which belongs not to the message, but to the messenger? In the case of Galileo the question has been answered; the astronomer was right, the theologians were wrong. The apparent statement that the sun went round the earth is now acknowledged to belong to the messenger, not to the message; to the language, not to the substance. The present state of science indicates that there will be more answers in the same direction. Geology, for instance, has already altered our conception of a great part of the Book of Genesis. Researches into ancient records seem likely to affect the details of the history of the early races of mankind. How each one of the many questions thus started will be ultimately answered it is impossible to say. The probability is that both the agreements and the discrepancies between science and the Biblical narrative will be very different from what we now suppose: but, at any rate, it is tolerably plain that the Bible is not to look to science for that confirmation of minute details which not very long ago was confidently expected, and in many cases apparently produced.

"Is there, then, no harmony between the Bible and science? Are they, if not foes, yet so distinct as to have no point of meeting? Not so. But this harmony is to be looked for in a different direction; not in petty details of fact are we to find it, but in the deep identity of tone, character, and spirit which pervade both the books."—Pp. 14, 15.

We would gladly, if our decreasing space permitted, quote the beautiful illustrations (pp. 15—17) which Dr. Temple offers of the united testimony which the book of Nature and the Bible offer of the patience and the munificent bountifulness of God, the adaptation of his works and his word to human feelings, and the sternness with which disobedience to law, whether natural or moral, is rebuked.

"The more the Bible is studied, and the more nature is studied, the deeper

will be found the harmony between them in character, the more assured the certainty that whoever inspired the one also made the other. And most assured will that certainty be in the mind of him who studies the Bible as it was meant to be studied, not as an interesting historical record, but as the guide of life, the revelation of spiritual truth, the awakener and the kindler of religious inspiration."—P. 17.

Our extracts have been sufficient to shew that Dr. Temple did justice to an occasion such as cannot often fall to the lot even of the most gifted ministers of religion. As he listened to that wise and eloquent discourse, the man of science must have felt that religion was a domain as full of interest and as deserving of his respect as the other departments of the works of the Creator; and the religious man must have felt that science, however it may confute folly and rebuke superstition, may yet be the handmaid of a pure and true theology.

An American View of the Causes which have led to the Decline of the Society of Friends in Great Britain and Ireland. Pp. 32. London—Bennett. 1860.

THE Society of Friends has rendered too many important services to the world to allow us to look with indifference on their possible extinction. Many, and some not unfounded, objections may be made to the mystical style of thought and uncouth speech and dress and other habits of this singular people; but these are mere specks in the sun when we remember their noble fidelity to principle and their laborious and truly catholic philanthropy. That the Friends have diminished and are diminishing in England is admitted. The cause of the decline has been recently made the subject of inquiry and dissertation in certain Prize Essays. The limitation of the inquiry to the United Kingdom appears to the writer of the pamphlet, the title of which we give above, unduly to limit the investigation, and to prevent the proper issue being raised.

In America, the Quakers do not diminish; and there at least we may indulge the hope that they will continue to protest in behalf of the spirituality of religion, of a free Christian ministry, and against war, capital punishments, oaths and slavery.

In Great Britain and Ireland, it is supposed that the whole number of Quakers little exceeds 18,000, whereas in the lifetime of George Fox they numbered 40,000. In America, there are three distinct organizations of the Society of Friends, their number amounting to 150,000.

The author traces the decline in England to three causes: 1. The increase of wealth and the worldly spirit. 2. An approximation to the doctrines of the Established Church. 3. Disownment by marriage. The remarks on the second head have most interest to us. The early Quakers differed from orthodox Christians on the doctrines of the Trinity, original sin and imputed righteousness, doctrines which they denied; and, on the other hand, they maintained the universal and saving light of Christ. During the present century, and especially the second quarter of it, the preaching and writings of the late Joseph John Gurney exercised over his religious body great influence, leading them to what are considered "evangelical" views of faith. To this influence the author before us attributes the absorption by the evangelical party of the Church of a considerable number of the Society of Friends. He maintains that the doctrine of Joseph John Gurney differed from early

Friends on these four heads,—the Trinity, original sin, imputed righteousness, and the atonement with its several branches of doctrine. How our author treats his subject will be sufficiently shewn by a single extract.

"The doctrine of the Trinity, or tri-personality of the Deity, was denied by the early Friends. They acknowledged the scriptural doctrine of Father, Word, and Spirit; but they rejected the term 'person' as applied to them, and they insisted that 'these three are one.' Not three persons, but one indivisible and omnipresent Spirit, who created the world, who enlightened the minds of the holy men of old, who 'was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself,' and 'who is not far from every one of us, for in Him we live, and move, and have our being.' George Fox, in many passages, controverts the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead. In reply to Christopher Wade, he says: 'Thou knowest not Him that is in the Father, and the Father in Him, glorified with the Father before the world began. And the Scripture doth not tell people of a Trinity, nor three persons, but the Common Prayer mass-book speaks of three persons brought in by thy father the Pope; and the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, was always one.' Joseph John Gurney, on the contrary, held the common Trinitarian doctrine, although he did not use the word Trinity. He speaks of the 'personality of the Holy Spirit,' and thinks the apostles 'regarded the Holy Spirit as one possessing a personal authority, exercising personal powers, and requiring a personal allegiance.' In treating of the Supreme Being, he writes of 'the personality and unity in Him of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit.'”—Pp. 20, 21.

We have been greatly interested by the whole of this pamphlet, which abounds with opinions sincerely and earnestly expressed. The author is anxious for the continuance of the Society, which has, he believes, an important mission, as yet only partially fulfilled. He thinks that if Friends will return to the simplicity of their founders, and keep fearlessly free from the popular theology, and trust not so much to schemes of doctrine intellectually or textually elaborated, as to the overflowing of divine love in the heart, they may yet do a great work, and prove that their doctrine and discipline are, more than in any other sect, in accordance with Christian principles.

Reasons why I am a Unitarian, in a Series of Letters to a Friend. By John R. Beard, D.D. Second Edition. London—Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1860.

DURING the time that we have unwillingly delayed our review of this vigorous apology for Unitarian Christianity, a not small edition of it has been absorbed by the public; and we hasten to notice it (our space forbids a lengthened review), lest it should by our further delay reach a third edition before its merits are spoken of in our pages. In less than 100 pages, Dr. Beard gives us twelve letters, in which the characteristics of Unitarianism are so described that every reader may thoroughly understand the subject. The diversities as well as the agreements of Unitarians are candidly stated. Unitarianism is described as worthy of the Christian's acceptance, because it is intelligible, real and reasonable; because, being true, it is positive, permanent and fitted to become universal; because it is favourable to freedom, and while essentially scriptural is yet progressive; because it is practical and salutary, conducive to piety, honourable to the Saviour and promotive of holiness. Such a religion makes polytheism abhorrent to the mind, and is a pre-

servative from the metaphysical snares of pantheism. Unitarianism necessarily tends to free the mind from the bonds of a sectarian spirit. The importance of Unitarianism is further manifested in being the most ancient form of Christianity, and so leading the mind and heart directly to Christ. Such a religion must be sufficient for man, and will prove the central point of the one universal church. These are the principal heads under which Dr. Beard ranges his proofs from reason and scripture in behalf of Unitarianism.

The passage which we select as a specimen of our author's mode of conducting his argument, relates to polytheism and pantheism.

"Trinitarianism ever tends to polytheism, with no small risk to end in pantheism. It ever tends to polytheism. There is but one branch of the entire Church in which Trinitarianism is what it was, retaining all the qualities of its fully developed form. That form is Roman Catholicism. Here, then, we may see Trinitarianism, as in its perfect condition, so in its natural fruits. Accordingly, here are 'gods many and lords many,' not less than in the heathenism described by Paul. Besides the greater gods, the Roman pantheon is crowded with demi-gods, heroes, local gods, gods of nations, gods of individuals. To the long-recognised number of the greater gods, another has, in process of time, been added; and as in ancient days Zeus dethroned Chronos, so now Mary eclipses the three persons of the Trinity. Even in Protestant Trinitarianism a somewhat similar result is observed, for now the Father is practically supreme, and now the Son, while the Holy Ghost finds little beyond a nominal recognition.

"Facts such as these can little satisfy the logical demands of philosophical speculation. Accordingly, in Germany, Trinitarianism has begotten pantheism, while pantheism adopts the nomenclature of Trinitarianism. What, in the mouths of Hegel and Strauss, is the Trinity but the passage of the subject into the object? The Father is the Infinite which, through the Holy Ghost, becomes the Son; while, reversely, the Son, through the Holy Ghost, returns into the Father. Thus life is transition. Thus the universe is change. Thus all is everything and everything is all. Sad to think that speculation, encouraged and aided by ecclesiastical falsities, should have resolved the grand biblical reality of one God into such aerial films.

"Yet to an issue so direful tends every departure from the strict monotheism of the Bible. The statement is vouched for by the history of the Church. Not content with scriptural simplicity, Greek speculators, aided by the slender forms of divinity to which they had from their cradles been used, and under the influence of which they could and did ascribe divinity to the slightest manifestation of what seemed to them divine, soon saw, in the perfections of Jesus, reason enough to give him the name of God, which they gave to so many inferior objects. The result was aided by exaggerated love and blind reverence. Then poetry came to throw its hues and images about the new divinity. By and by logic intervened, and, on its hard anvil, gave consistency and form to the divine birth. The deification of Christ potentially contained the Athanasian Trinity. The first step down the steep declivity of theological speculation was set, and thenceforward descent was unavoidable, nor could it be stopped until the bottom was reached. Yet even in the vale there was a depth so deep as to require centuries to fathom; nor has the lowest point been got to even by the Marian idolatry of the present hour; for why should not the Pope, who can place a divinity on the ecclesiastical Olympus, assume there a seat for himself?"—Pp. 55, 56.

Dr. Beard has, we think, by the publication of this earnest and timely plea for our faith, entitled himself to the respect of all who delight in a scriptural, reasonable and free religion, such as Unitarianism is.

INTELLIGENCE.

PROCEEDINGS ON LAYING THE FOUNDATION-STONE OF A UNITARIAN CHURCH IN BIRMINGHAM.

The site of the New Meeting-house, Birmingham, having become unsuitable to the members of the congregation, it was resolved to erect a new place of worship in a more convenient situation. The Committee and various members of the congregation therefore assembled, on Saturday, August 11, 1860, on the site which had been previously chosen in Broad Street, to lay the foundation-stone of the new church. The proceedings commenced with a prayer by the Rev. Charles Clarke, the minister of the Old Meeting-house.

The Chairman of the Vestry Committee, Mr. Samuel Smith, then presented to Timothy Kenrick, Esq., the Chairman of the Congregational Committee, a handsome silver trowel, bearing the following inscription, which he read to the meeting :

“Presented to Timothy Kenrick, Esq., by the Congregation of the New Meeting, on the occasion of his laying the Foundation-stone of the Church of the Messiah, Birmingham, August 11th, 1860.”

Mr. Kenrick having returned thanks for this gift of the congregation, proceeded to mention that there were enclosed in the bottle which had been placed in the foundation-stone, a copy of the following newspapers of the day, viz., the “Times,” the “Birmingham Journal,” and “Aris’ Birmingham Gazette;” also some coins of the present year, and a plan of the church and of the schools;—that the church was designed to afford accommodation of 600 sittings for the congregation and 250 sittings for the school children; and that the schools were arranged to accommodate 200 girls and 250 boys. He then proceeded to read the following copy of a document which had also been deposited in the foundation-stone :

“The Church of the Messiah. This Building, of which the Foundation-stone is this day laid, is dedicated to the worship of Almighty God, by the Congregation of Christian Worshippers now assembling in the New Meeting-house, Moor Street, Birmingham; once under the pastoral care of the illustrious Dr. Priestley, throughout the entire term of his residence in this town; and from the year 1803, for fifty years, under that of the late eminently learned and pious, the Reverend John Kentish. The present Members of this Congregation address their worship to God the Father alone; honouring, but not wor-

shipping, His Son Jesus Christ, by acknowledging that through him they have access unto the Father. Desirous of maintaining inviolate the Christian liberty which they themselves enjoy, and of transmitting it unimpaired to their descendants, they leave this House of Worship free and unfettered. Avowing and exercising their own distinct profession of belief, they prescribe no form of profession whatever for others, but have faith in truth and in the God of truth, that if His Word have free course it will be glorified.” Then followed the names of the Minister, Wardens and Committee.

Mr. Kenrick having laid the stone, the Rev. Samuel Bache delivered the following address :

My Christian Friends,—The document which has already been placed within the foundation-stone just laid, records, briefly but clearly, both our religious principles and our religious history. In what I have to say at this time, I shall attempt no more than to pursue the same topics into some farther detail.

We are met together here to found a house for the worship of God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and our God and Father. He is the God whom *alone* we find revealed both in nature and scripture, and Him *alone*, therefore, do we acknowledge and worship; in conformity with the express declaration of His anointed Prophet and beloved Son Jesus, in the very act of solemn prayer to his and our Father: “This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.”* Wherefore we acknowledge and honour Jesus whom the Father hath sent, but do not worship him, as indeed the Christ. Hence the designation which we have chosen for this sacred building, “The Church of the Messiah,”—“the Church,” because erected for the congregation or assembly of devout worshippers of God in the name and spirit of His Son, who, whether meeting around the family altar or in the temple which their own hands have raised, constitute a Christian church;† and “The Church of the Messiah,” who is commonly called Christ,‡

* John xvii. 3.

† Compare Rom. xvi. 5, Coloss. iv. 15, and Philem. 2, with Acts xi. 26, and various similar passages.

‡ John iv. 25.

because we would hereby distinctly and gratefully own the divine authority of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in things pertaining unto God; and avow our solemn purpose, under God's blessing, of obeying his commandments and walking in his steps.

As disciples of him who came into the world to bear witness to the truth,* we regard it as at once our duty and our privilege to prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good;† and to confess with our mouth what we believe in our hearts to be among the solemn verities of God's providence and will concerning us.‡ Applying our best intelligence seriously and honestly to the interpretation of both the works and the word of God, in the faith that He hath endowed us with reason chiefly for this high purpose, and that the fundamental principles of his government are the same throughout both the moral and spiritual universe which He hath made and ever sustains, we learn that He is God and that there is no God else beside Him;§ that Jehovah is one and His name one;|| and hence we reject entirely every sentiment and every practice which is not strictly in accordance with these fundamental verities; and, as Unitarian Christians (in contradistinction from those who confessing a trinity of persons in the God-head are therefore correctly designated *Trinitarians*)—as Unitarian Christians, restrict our worship to Him whom Christ especially has revealed as his and our Father, his and our God.¶

We believe that where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty;** and we therefore consecrate this house of worship to freedom as to truth: not desiring to impose our sentiments upon any; but willing to welcome all who desire to unite with us in Christian worship, and for the cultivation of the Christian life, without presuming to judge one another,†† or to judge for one another; knowing that every man must bear his own burden‡‡ of responsibility, and that we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.|||

We believe that faith without works is dead being alone:||| that no man for saying Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of

our Father who is in heaven.* We believe that it is both our obligation and our blessedness, as God gives us opportunity or enables us to discover opportunity, to do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith:† in the memorable words of our Divine Teacher, that "It is more blessed to give than to receive."‡ We believe that pure religion and undefiled before God even the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world.§

We believe that charity, or universal love, is the fulfilling of the social law,|| and the unfailing bond of perfectness;¶ and that he who loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot possibly love God whom he hath not seen.** We believe that the maintenance of the truth in love,†† is the most effectual, as it is assuredly the most Christian method of keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; till we all come, in the unity of the faith and knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the full stature of Christ;‡‡—or as Jesus himself expresses the same idea under another more beautiful figure—until he himself bring us all together through our hearing (that is, obeying) his voice, so that "there shall be one fold, one shepherd."§§

Wherefore we endeavour to make the benediction of the apostle the prevailing sentiment of our hearts towards *all* our fellow-christians, whether they agree with us in doctrinal opinions or differ from us ever so widely:—"Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith, from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."|||

We believe that, in the spirit and power of his holy gospel, Christ must reign until God hath put all enemies under his feet; that the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death; that God hath put all things under his (Christ's) feet; but that when it is said, All things are put under him, it is manifest that He is excepted who did put all things under him; and that when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto Him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.¶¶

And it is our solemn purpose to cherish this belief and to strengthen it within our

* John xviii. 37.

† 1 Thess. v. 21.

‡ Romans x. 9.

§ Isaiah xlv. 21.

|| Zechariah xiv. 9.

¶ John xx. 17.

** 2 Cor. iii. 17.

†† Rom. xiv. 13.

‡‡ Gal. vi. 5.

§§ 2 Cor. v. 10.

||| James ii. 17.

* Matt. vii. 21. † Gal. vi. 10.

‡ Acts xx. 35. § James i. 27.

|| Romans xiii. 10. ¶ Coloss. iii. 14.

** 1 John iv. 20. †† Eph. iv. 15.

‡‡ Eph. iv. 3—13. §§ John x. 16.

||| Eph. vi. 23, 24. ¶¶ 1 Cor. x. 25—28.

hearts, by coming up in company with our brethren to this house of God, in order that we may here worship Him, as Christ hath taught us we must worship Him if we would worship Him acceptably, “in spirit and in truth.”* This is what our pious forefathers did in their day; men whose faith and whose example it is an honour to us to follow. Ours is indeed a noble spiritual ancestry. The list of those who have ministered in holy things to this congregation from its first establishment,—to say nothing now of those who still survive, or of the private members of the congregation itself, many of whom have richly deserved an equally honourable memorial,—that list exhibits names which we can never pronounce without an admiring and grateful reverence. Bourn and Blyth, Hawkes, Edwards and Toulmin,—these are venerable names of the good departed, who, in their day of arduous service, severally approved themselves workmen that needed not to be ashamed, rightly dividing (through evil report as well as through good report)—rightly dividing the word of truth:† while the name of Priestley is now hailed by the true and generous-hearted votaries of science (speaking by the mouth of one of the most distinguished Professors of science in the venerable University of Oxford) as among the most famous of the names of the benefactors of our race, the most famous of the names of those who laid the foundations of the sciences by which the condition of humanity has been raised.‡ And this name is sacred to our memories and hearts, my brethren, for far higher services still; for free inquiry into the evidences and truths of religion, natural and revealed, and the consistent and fearless avowal of its results; for simplicity and purity of Christian doctrine; for humble, earnest, holy faith; for love unfeigned, and the very gospel spirit of forgiveness; for zealous attention to the instruction and culture of the rising race; and for the practical application of Christian principles to the daily conduct of life:—while the name of the venerable pastor and friend most recently taken from our midst,§ is still cherished among us as, like Priestley’s, another name for independence

and freedom, for candour and faith, for sound and accurate learning, for the critical but reverential study of God’s holy word, for piety and universal love, for earnest devotion to the instruction and welfare of this Christian church, in which he laboured diligently and affectionately for a period of fifty years.

Let us emulate the devotion of these men to truth and freedom, to the best interests of our fellow-men, to the devout and reverential service of God. Let us combine, as they did, the love of God with the love of our neighbour, and be diligent and faithful, as they were, in strengthening each other’s hands and cheering each other’s hearts in the great work of life, and in endeavouring to train up our children in the love of God and in the practice of virtue. You have given abundant evidence, my friends, the younger among you as well as those who are advanced in life, how highly you appreciate these great ends, and how determined you are to prosecute them. May God bless you, both in your purposes and your efforts, both for your own and each other’s welfare! And may this house which we have now begun to raise (if we who now lay the foundation-stone be spared to enter the completed structure) be indeed our spirit’s home, sanctified by faith, by devotion and by love; so that in it God may in very deed dwell with us and we with Him! And may our children, and our children’s children, through many successive generations, hither come to worship their own and their fathers’ God in the beauty of holiness; until, prepared by the varied discipline of this changeful world, we take up our abode in the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;* and in what we shall then feel as the more immediate presence and glory of our unseen but ever-present, ever-gracious God, shall join the general assembly and church of the first-born,† and the beloved ones who are gone before us to those realms of light, meeting them to part no more for ever. May God grant it, for His infinite mercy’s sake, in Christ Jesus our Lord!

The whole proceedings concluded with a prayer by Rev. S. Bache.

* John iv. 23. † 2 Tim. ii. 15.

‡ Speech of B. C. Brodie, Esq., Professor of Chemistry in the University of Oxford, reported in the *Christian Reformer* for August, 1860, p. 510.

§ The Rev. John Kentish, whose ministry in the New Meeting-house began Jan. 23, 1803, and ended with his life March 6, 1853.

WARWICKSHIRE UNITARIAN TRACT SOCIETY.

The fifty-fourth annual general meeting of this Society was held in the Protestant Dissenting chapel, Stourbridge, on Tuesday, Aug. 14, when the religious service was introduced by Rev. W. O. McGowan, of Coseley, and the sermon (which was well

* 2 Cor. v. 1.

† Heb. xii. 23.

characterized in a subsequent resolution as “earnest, able and truly Christian”) was preached by Rev. John Lettis Short, of Bridport, from 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6: “Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God, who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.”

At the close of the service, the chair was taken by Mr. Thomas Yate Lee, of Kinver, when the services of the various officers for the past year were duly acknowledged, appointments made for the year ensuing, and other business transacted.

About fifty members and friends of the Society, ladies as well as gentlemen, afterwards dined together, under the able presidency of J. Francis Lee, Esq., of Kinver, when the usual loyal and liberal sentiments were proposed,—the good wishes of the Society were expressed for the Rev. Dr. Davison, the Rev. Stephenson Hunter, the Rev. Thomas Hunter and the Rev. D. D. Jeremy, on occasion of their leaving this district,—and a collection was spontaneously made at the suggestion of the friends resident in Stourbridge, amounting to £7. 15s., towards the liquidation of the debt of £20. 3s. 1d. due to the Treasurer. Affecting reference was made to the many changes which have taken place in the body of subscribers in general and in the Stourbridge congregation in particular, since the last meeting of the Society in that town fifteen years ago; and cheering sympathy was warmly expressed with the congregation assembling in the New Meeting-house, Birmingham, in connection with the laying the foundation-stone of their new house of worship, “the Church of the Messiah,” on the previous Saturday.—The entire proceedings of the meeting were of the most harmonious and encouraging character.

MR. GANGOOLY.

This interesting young man has been making the best possible use of his time since his arrival at Liverpool. He has preached twice every Sunday, visiting in succession the following places—Liverpool, Birkenhead, Chester, Belfast, Manchester, Leeds and Bristol. He has also paid visits and taken part in week-evening services or public lectures and meetings at Dublin, Swinton, Wakefield, York, Hull, Chesterfield, Mansfield, Gloucester, Cheltenham and Evesham. Nearly the whole of his time during his intended stay in Great Britain is mapped out in successive engagements at Birmingham, in Scotland, Lon-

don, the Eastern counties, &c. Liberal collections have been generally made for the Indian Mission, with which, in conjunction with Mr. Dall, he is to be connected. Our letters speak warmly of the impression Mr. Gangooly makes upon the audiences he addresses and on the persons with whom he holds intercourse. Recent communications from America tell us of some virulent attacks on Mr. Gangooly in the public press. They are anonymous and have appeared since Mr. G. left America. They have called forth some warm defences. The Rev. J. F. Clarke, the Secretary of the American Unitarian Association, writes in the *Monthly Journal*, in an article entitled “Western Tour,”—“Gangooly had bidden us farewell; and we, who had learned to love him well, had also bidden him God-speed. Men of the most opposite tendencies had joined in an affectionate leave-taking of this young man; of whom we venture to say, that no one has seen him intimately without becoming attached to him. His simplicity, purity of purpose and earnest convictions, have made him dear to many hearts.”

The Editor, in an article devoted to the subject of the “Attacks on Gangooly,” pronounces them “superficial” in their grounds, and says in conclusion,—

“We cannot stand by in silence, when a young man, whom we have learned to love and esteem for his candour and earnest desire to be a Christian, is coolly charged with hypocrisy and all baseness. He may turn out at last to be ‘a failure,’ and so may any of us turn out to be failures. We have, perhaps, been imprudent and precipitate in sympathizing with him, accepting him, and placing confidence in him; but when one comes to us, either from Andover, Oxford, New Haven or Calcutta, asking for Christian sympathy and kindness, we trust that we may always be imprudent enough to give it to him, even though he may, by possibility, hereafter prove a ‘failure.’

“Those to whom Joguth was consigned by the missionary have done as well as they could by him; and, on the whole, have no reason to be dissatisfied with the result. He has been a faithful student, docile and obedient to his guardians and instructors. Those who have had the charge of him have all come to love him and believe in his sincerity. Those who have seen most of him think most highly of him. That he has faults, is probable. That some of the old heathenism is still sticking in him, is likely. But it is not by such assaults as are contained in these letters that we can help the half-converted and half-regenerate into more of purity

and of righteousness. A little more sympathy with the weak, erring and sinful, would be more Christian and more wise."

THE REV. J. C. GANGOOLY'S VISIT TO
MANCHESTER.

The Unitarians of this city and neighbourhood have received a great impulse from the visit of the Rev. J. C. Gangooly. Much pardonable curiosity was manifested by great numbers to obtain a glimpse of a man whose superiority to caste prejudices and national jealousies had enabled him to break away from the fetters of a stern and unyielding philosophy, and sacrifice home and friends for the sake of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. In a time so distinguished for its commercial rivalries and competitions as the present, when to a great extent the self-sacrificing spirit of Christianity is in bondage to the spirit of the world, it is felt to be positively refreshing to stand face to face with a man, and shake him by the hand, who has so realized the true nature of the teachings of Christ as to put into literal practice his most searching principles. Hence when Mr. Gangooly stood up in the grand old chapel in Cross Street on Sunday morning, Aug. 12, he was surrounded by a vast congregation who filled the spacious building to the very doors, many persons being compelled to stand in the aisles. For nearly an hour he spoke in simple and touching language, and succeeded in awakening a profound interest not only in himself, but in the great cause of Unitarian missions in India. In the evening of the same day, he preached to an equally large congregation in the chapel at Upper Brook Street, every available seat being occupied. Very beautifully did he refer to his own experience, and to the condition of the countless multitudes in his own country who were oppressed by the influence of dark and degrading superstitions; and there was something of genuine power and pathos in his allusion to the great work to which, under God's blessing, he was now about to devote his life. At the close of his address, many of the warm-hearted friends of Unitarian Christianity gathered around him, eager to shew their sympathy with him and their hearty admiration for his unflinching courage and unflagging zeal. He could not but be encouraged and strengthened when he felt the strong and honest grasp of loving hands, and heard the genuine words of Christian gentleness and love.

On Monday evening, the 13th, a large and splendid gathering of ministers and friends took place in the school-room, and afterwards, by adjournment, in the chapel

of Dr. Beard, to give a welcome to the distinguished visitor. Among the ministers who were present we observed the Revds. J. R. Beard, D.D., G. H. Wells, M.A., H. Green, M.A., J. Gordon, C. C. Nutter, J. Drummond, B.A., J. C. Street, E. Smith, M.A., G. Hoade, E. W. Hopkinson, T. E. Poynting, M. Gibson, W. Whitelegge, J. J. Bishop, B.A., J. Freston, J. Cropper, M.A., &c., with a number of the students of the Home Missionary Board and several students of the Manchester New College. After partaking of tea in the school-room, the meeting took place in the chapel. When a hymn had been sung, the Rev. Dr. Beard, who was in the chair, in a few introductory words, in which he spoke of Rammohun Roy and William Roberts, gave a personal greeting and welcome to Mr. Gangooly, and then called upon the Rev. J. Gordon to move a resolution of welcome on behalf of the meeting. In appropriate terms Mr. Gordon discharged his pleasing duty, and Mr. B. Heape, of Polefield, seconded the resolution. When Mr. Gangooly rose to address the meeting, he was received with hearty plaudits, long sustained. For upwards of an hour he riveted the attention of his audience by an interesting narrative, containing personal experiences, historical circumstances, graphic illustrations drawn from natural phenomena, and the state of opinion and prejudices among his countrymen; he corrected popular errors held by Englishmen with regard to the nature of the worship offered to Juggernaut, and dispelled the notion that Hindoos were habituated to throw themselves under the colossal car of this deity; he also pictured the condition of society among the Brahmins, and spoke especially of the hardships and restraints experienced by their women, and urged the necessity of sending out earnest female missionaries; and concluded his interesting speech, which was full of anecdote and humour, by telling of his determination to devote himself faithfully to the great work of preaching the gospel among his brethren. Remarks were then offered by the Revds. Henry Green and J. Drummond, and Professor Buckland, of Toronto, formerly the Domestic Missionary in Manchester, and then the interesting meeting was concluded by singing and prayer.

On Tuesday evening, Mr. Gangooly preached to a crowded congregation in the chapel at Swinton, where a hearty welcome was accorded to him by the zealous friends of Unitarian Christianity connected with that place.

We believe that liberal responses have been made to the appeal for funds, and

are quite sure that Mr. G.'s visit will be remembered with grateful feelings for many years to come.

J. C. S.

UNITARIAN QUAKERS IN MANCHESTER.

No little excitement has been felt among certain classes of the citizens of Manchester by a recent visit of Dr. J. W. Moore and Rachel Moore, his wife, from Philadelphia, U.S., the latter an approved minister of the Society of Friends. Most of our readers will remember the division which took place among the *Friends* in America on matters of Christian doctrine, which separated them into two distinct societies, the smaller of which was Trinitarian, and the larger and more influential being Unitarian. Dr. Moore and his wife are members of this latter body, and represent the opinions of upwards of seventy thousand Friends. Mrs. Moore, a lady of considerable culture and great refinement of manners, being deeply impressed with the idea that she must go forth and preach the gospel of the grace of God, has, in company with her husband, travelled in various parts of Great Britain, and preached wherever a favourable opportunity occurred. In every place, however, the English Quakers have issued protests against them, declaring that they are not members of any society recognized by *them* as belonging to the church of Christ, and in various other ways have striven to impede their efforts. It is greatly to be deplored that the Society of Friends in England, so distinguished as it is for wide and judicious benevolence and for prominence in all works of Christian philanthropy, should thus connect itself with a system of short-sighted exclusiveness and intolerant bigotry. If anywhere, we should certainly have expected among the English Quakers a large-hearted Christian charity which thinketh no evil. But we appear to be greatly mistaken. When Dr. and Mrs. Moore arrived in Manchester, no place was open to them wherein they might speak of the gospel of Christ. Fortunately they were directed to Dr. Beard, who, with the concurrence of his chapel committee, at once placed the Bridge-Street chapel at their disposal for a religious service. When their announcement of service was made, a disclaimer was advertised by the Manchester Quakers; they were evidently in a hurry to avoid anything like the supposition of heresy as applied to them. This disclaimer did not, however, prevent a large congregation assembling on Friday evening, Aug. 10, to hear what the new comers had to proclaim. The service was conducted in the way which is universally customary among the

Friends. Mrs. Moore then proceeded to give a full and clear account of the doctrines held by the denomination to which she belonged, taking occasion to argue with great force against the common doctrines of the Trinity, Atonement and Original Sin, and contending earnestly for views which are almost identical with those held by Unitarian Christians. During her address she maintained that the views she was explaining were those held by George Fox. Here she was interrupted by some over-zealous and not good-mannered friend, who called out, "*It is not true.*" Mrs. Moore proceeded quietly with her address, and presently quoted the very words of George Fox which proved that her statements were perfectly correct. She was not again interrupted, but concluded her deeply interesting statement amid the profound silence of her audience. When the people were leaving the chapel, printed documents were put into their hands by some of the Manchester Quakers.

On the evening of Sunday, Aug. 12, the Unitarian chapel at Swinton was placed at the disposal of Dr. and Mrs. Moore for a religious service. The chapel was well filled with an intelligent and appreciating audience. The address of Mrs. Moore was very striking and effective, and revealed a singular agreement between the doctrines of the Friends and those of Unitarians. Our Unitarian friends were exceedingly gratified with what they heard. Dr. and Mrs. Moore expressed the great satisfaction they had felt at the generous treatment they had experienced at the hands of the Unitarians of Manchester, and at the friendly greetings they had received from the Revds. J. R. Beard, D.D., J. C. Street and C. C. Nutter, and Mr. J. Armstrong. Their mission is a thoroughly disinterested one; they are travelling entirely at their own expense, and paying for all rooms, printing, advertising, &c. We know that offers of pecuniary assistance have more than once been made, and have been firmly but gracefully declined. We trust that wherever they go they will receive kind and courteous treatment at the hands of Unitarians. We cannot but once more express our surprise and regret that the English Friends should imitate the conduct of many Trinitarian controversialists, and offer an opposition so little in harmony with the gentle graces of Christianity and their own professions of brotherly love.

UNITARIAN CHAPEL, BLACKLEY, NEAR MANCHESTER.

In this small but growing village there has been a Unitarian chapel since 1697,

which has never been largely attended, but for a long time past, until the beginning of the present year, its worshipers have numbered between 20 and 30 only. These have formed its regular congregation, who have ordinarily met once only on the Sabbath, the pulpit being supplied by students of the Home Missionary College. Very few strangers from the neighbourhood ever entered its walls. Unitarianism they had been taught to dread, though they did not understand it. About four months ago, the Rev. J. C. Street, superintendent missionary of the Manchester district, took it under his charge, with the intention of working up a congregation out of its neighbourhood. The results up to the present time are most gratifying. A course of lectures was delivered in the evenings, which drew together upwards of 130 hearers, very few of whom had ever been in a Unitarian place of worship before the commencement of those lectures. A school was formed and a good staff of teachers at once obtained, and notwithstanding the greatest opposition shewn by the orthodox bodies in the pulpits and in the homes of the people, the number of scholars has steadily and constantly increased.

At the opening of the school, 20 scholars were present, and last Sunday (the seventh from its commencement) 60 scholars and a corresponding number of teachers were present. A young women's Bible class has also been established, conducted by the Rev. J. C. Street, every Tuesday evening, at which 14 adult scholars attend. Seeing that a warm interest was excited in the neighbourhood, the opportunity which a holiday afforded was seized upon, and a tea-party was announced. The school-room (a room in the Mechanics' Institution) not being at liberty, the tea was served in chapel. On Monday, Aug. 6th, at five o'clock, more than a hundred persons sat down to drink tea off tables placed in the pews for that purpose. The usual verses were sung, and the tea passed very satisfactorily.

After a short interval, during which the tables were cleared and everything set in order, E. Brookes, Esq., took the chair. After a voluntary on the organ, a hymn was sung, and the Rev. C. C. Nutter (who is at present assisting the Rev. J. C. Street) spoke on "The Unitarian Missions at Home and Abroad," followed by J. Bennett, Esq., on "The Blackley Sunday-school." A hymn was then sung, when all adjourned into the chapel-yard to watch the ascent of a small balloon which was prepared to please the younger portion of the meeting. Another hymn was sung, and Mr. William Oates, student of the

Home Missionary College, spoke on "The Blackley Unitarian Chapel," followed by the Rev. E. W. Hopkinson on "Missions to the Poor." Mr. Noah Green, of the Home Missionary College, spoke on the "Household of Faith;" and the Rev. J. C. Street very appropriately ended the speaking in a very able manner by an address on the "Manchester District Unitarian Association." A vote of thanks to the Chairman was then passed for the efficient manner in which he had filled his office; and E. Wadsworth, Esq., also received the thanks of the meeting for his very skilful and acceptable services on the organ. The meeting separated about half-past nine, having concluded with a hymn and prayer; and many smiling faces told that it had given great satisfaction.

With such instances as this before us, we have good reason to discontinue the use of such phrases as, "Unitarianism is a tree of slow growth"—"Unitarianism appeals to the head more than to the heart, and therefore is embraced only by cold, logical, calculating natures." This and many other similar instances prove the fallacy of both these sayings. Here at least the doctrines of Unitarianism have approved themselves to the hearts and minds of those who had attended the Wesleyan chapel and the church, also of many who did not usually attend any place of worship. It has not grown slowly here, but very rapidly, and under good care, as it is and has been, continued success is sure. Already the room in the Mechanics' Institution, which for a Sunday-school was thought large enough at any rate for twelve months, is found to be too small. There is a great improvement in the attendance at both services in the chapel. The future which is opening out for the Blackley Unitarian chapel is a very auspicious one, and highly gratifying to those who are working for and who feel interested in its welfare.

W. O.

KENT AND SUSSEX UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN
ASSOCIATION.

The forty-eighth anniversary was held in the General Baptist chapel, Hamond Hill, Chatham, on Wednesday, July 25th. The Rev. W. H. Quinn, the minister of the congregation, introduced the services; and the Rev. J. Panton Ham, of Essex-Street chapel, London, delivered an excellent and appropriate discourse. At two p.m., the members and friends of the Association, to the number of between 90 and 100, dined together at the Crown Hotel, Rochester, under the able presidency of Sir John Bowring, supported by John

Tribe, Esq., as Vice-chairman. The usual sentiments were proposed and duly honoured:—“The Queen;” “The rest of the Royal Family;” “The Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association,” in reply to which the annual report was read by the Secretary, the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, of Maidstone; “Civil and Religious Liberty all the World over,” responded to by the Rev. Wm. Smith, of Canterbury; “The Rev. J. Panton Ham, and thanks for his discourse,” which that gentleman suitably acknowledged; “Health and long life to Sir John Bowring,” proposed by the Vice-chairman; the “Fourth Estate of the Realm,” spoken to by the editor of one of the local papers; “The Mayor, Corporation and Magistrates of the city of Rochester,” which called up Mr. Tribe on the part of the Corporation, and Mr. Steele, a liberal Churchman present, on the part of the Magistracy; “The glorious Two Thousand,” which drew forth an eloquent address from John Brent, Esq., Jun., F.S.A., of Canterbury. After less than an hour's intermission, the same party, slightly increased, assembled to tea, Sir John Bowring still presiding; when stirring speeches were made by the Rev. J. O. Squier, of Headcorn, on “Our Pious Forefathers;” the Rev. W. H. Quinn, on “The Duty of bearing witness to the Truth;” and the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, on “The Coming Age.”

This was the most successful meeting that has been held in Kent for many years; and much of its interest and value are owing to the observations made by the Chairman in proposing the different sentiments, abounding as those remarks did in the results both of study and of travel. It was noted with hopefulness, that of the five ministers present on the occasion, not less than four, namely, Messrs. Ham, Maclellan, Squier and Quinn, had been brought up even to man's estate as Trinitarians and Calvinists. Twenty-five years had elapsed since this anniversary was last held in Chatham; but so great were the pleasure and profit experienced from this reunion, that the friends present from London, Maidstone, Tenterden, Canterbury and Dover, look forward to many similar meetings in the same locality.

LIST OF PREACHERS AND THEIR SUBJECTS
AT CLEATOR.

1860. July 29, Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D., Manchester—Morning: The Members of a Household (Matt. xii. 46). Afternoon: Worldly Prosperity—whence does it come? The Secularistic View and the Christian (Prov. x. 22).

Aug. 26, Rev. T. E. Poynting, Merton—Morning: Christ the Physician of Souls (Mark ii. 17). Afternoon: Christ the highest Manifestation of Spiritual Life (1 John i. 2).

Sept. 30, Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Bolton-le-Moors—Morning: God always around our Path and about our Ways (Gen. iii. 9). Afternoon: The Dispute between Paul and Peter at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11—14).

Oct. 28, Rev. John Wright, B.A., Bury—Morning: Divine Influence and Human Free-will (Romans viii. 26, Phil. ii. 12). Afternoon: Every Employment may be a Religious Ministry (Luke viii. 39).

Nov. 25, Rev. Andrew Creery, M.A., Stockport—Morning: The Joys of a True Faith (Phil. iv. 4). Afternoon: Man's Need of God (Exod. iii. part of 12).

Dec. 30, Rev. S. A. Steinthal, Liverpool—Morning: Certainty and Change (Luke xxi. 33)—Sacrament—Afternoon: The Joy of Religion (Phil. iv. 4).

1861. Jan. 27, Rev. Henry Green, M.A., Knutsford—Morning: Prayer the Remedy for Anxiousness of Heart (Phil. iv. 6, 7). Afternoon: Religion the Agent that develops and raises Human Nature (Eph. iv. 11—13).

Feb. 24, Rev. W. H. Herford, Lancaster—Morning: Christ crucified, the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God (1 Cor. i. 23, 24). Afternoon: Our Aids against Temptation (Romans viii. 26).

March 31, Rev. G. H. Wells, M.A., Gorton—Morning: The Connection between Christianity and the Social Affections (John xix. 26, 27). Afternoon: Public Worship (Psalm xxvi. 8).

April 28, Rev. J. T. Whitehead, Ainsworth—Morning: Moral Blindness (John iii. 19). Afternoon: Religion and the World (John xvii. 15).

May 26, Rev. John Gordon, Dukinfield—Morning: The Draught of Fishes (John xxi. 6). Afternoon: The Good Centurion (Matt. viii. 5—13).

June 30, Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., Manchester—Morning: Christians ought to excel Others (Matt. v. 47). Afternoon: Christian Views of Human Nature (Romans ii. 14).

Morning service at 10.45. Afternoon service at 3 o'clock.

CONVERTS TO AND FROM UNITARIANISM.

The last report of the Unitarian Association of America contains a reference to certain theological changes, the balance of which was largely in favour of the Unitarian church,—the principal loss being that of Professor Huntington, whose opinions

had long been indefinite and open to suspicion,—and the gains including Messrs. Baldwin, Ames, Town, Calthorp, Miller, &c. In England, two gentlemen have just retired from the church with which they have been hitherto associated; and here we have to speak of a loss and a gain. Rev. H. V. Palmer, formerly assistant to the late Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, has received ordination as a curate from the Archbishop of York. On the cessation of his engagement at York, after some ineffectual efforts to settle with an Unitarian congregation at Wakefield, Rochdale, &c., and after preaching in the pulpit of his friend, the late Rev. G. Harris, he suddenly dissociated himself from his Unitarian friends, and made overtures to the authorities at York to be admitted into the bosom and ministry of the Church of England. Mr. Palmer is an amiable man, and will, we dare say, if he obtains preferment, make a useful parochial clergyman, but neither in regard to talent or learning (for he had not the advantage of a professional education) is his secession of any importance. On the other side of the denominational account we now have to name the public adoption of Unitarian opinions by the Rev. John Thomas, B.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge, till within a few weeks curate of Earsdon, in the county of Northumberland, and previously and for two years curate at St. George's, in Manchester. Mr. Thomas has preached, and with great acceptance, in the Unitarian pulpits at Kentish Town and Hackney, and has left a very favourable impression of his piety and his professional ability on the minds of the ministers of those two congregations. Mr. Thomas is, we believe, prepared to enter, whenever the opportunity is given him, on the stated ministry amongst the Unitarians. As in America, so in England, the balance in these theological changes is of a kind to give us perfect satisfaction.

CIRENCESTER.

The ancient Presbyterian chapel in this town, which has for some time been closed, was opened for public worship on Sunday, Aug. 19, by Rev. Samuel Martin, of Trowbridge. About thirty persons attended the morning service, and in the evening the chapel was pretty well filled. The excellent services of Mr. Martin were listened to with deep interest. At the close of the evening service, Mr. Martin requested the congregation to remain, and he addressed them in explanation of the present state of the chapel, and the wish of the trustees to re-organize public worship. He

also took the opportunity of distributing tracts, which were eagerly received by the people. Several persons assured him that if a respectable Unitarian minister were stationed in Cirencester, a fair congregation would soon be gathered. But forty years of neglect have left the place in a most dilapidated condition, and before anything can be done in the way of collecting a congregation, it will be necessary to repair the chapel and to make preparations for heating and lighting the building. These matters, we are glad to know, are receiving the attention of Rev. William James, of Bristol, and the Committee of the Western Union, and we have no doubt that means will be taken to effect whatever is necessary.

THEOLOGY IN OUR COURTS OF LAW.

However admirable our courts of law may be in sifting facts, we cannot praise them as places for the elucidation of opinions in theology. There is so much that is vague and undefined in the phraseology of religious polemics, that on the meaning of some particular word, of no small importance perhaps to a just decision in the case, the Judge may have a very different impression from that entertained by the counsel on one side or the other, and the jury may scarcely have a conviction or a feeling in common with the witnesses. Again, prejudice has so large a domain in all theological discussions, and persons untrained in logic so frequently confound together a doctrine and *their own conclusions respecting it*, that, with equal honesty of intention, two men hearing the same evidence shall reach conclusions in direct opposition. On these accounts we commonly feel some regret when theological opinions which we believe to be true and important become the themes of counsel learned in the law, and are disserted upon in a Judge's charge, and have to be decided on by that unreliable intellectual apparatus, an English jury. At the recent assizes for South Lancashire, a case occurred in which there was throughout a great deal of theological arguing, and the result of which was, we imagine, unsatisfactory to all concerned. An Unitarian schoolmaster of Todmorden, named Harrison, claimed damages from a grocer of the same town for a libel, in which he was charged with teaching his pupils that the Bible was full of lies. The defendant attempted, but wholly failed, to justify the libel. The presiding Judge, Mr. Baron Wilde, held the scales of justice with a firm and even hand, and the jury, under his guidance, found a verdict for the plaintiff, but nulli-

fied the verdict by assessing the damages on the amount of the smallest coin of the land. Some portion of the Judge's charge, as reported in an "orthodox" version of the trial now before us, is worthy of being preserved:

"A very great deal had been said about the plaintiff putting new constructions on passages of Scripture; but it was one thing to attach a meaning different to that generally received to a particular word or two, and another to say that the Bible contained lies. Mankind had largely and widely at all times disputed upon certain words, but the very men who had so disputed—the men who had most ardently entered into controversy—were generally precisely the most conscientious men, having the greatest possible respect for the Bible itself; and to say of a man when he put a different construction upon a certain passage, that he was saying the Bible was full of lies, was to put into his mouth an expression of irreverence towards the Bible which was the last of his objects to create or to say. On the question of damages, he advised the jury, if they found for the plaintiff, to give such damages as would vindicate his character. He hoped the jury would not allow themselves to be launched into the theological controversy, or to take any strong position with either one party or the other. It was a misfortune that the controversy had arisen in the way it had done. It was much better that gentlemen should confine themselves to lecturing, and not invite a public discussion upon matters which were intricate beyond all measure, and which had puzzled—and probably would continue to puzzle—the wisest, the most learned and the most ingenious of mankind, ever since the time when the sacred volume was written."

The angry controversy at Todmorden originated in a lecture of an itinerating gentleman of considerable notoriety, named Brindley. One object we have in noticing this matter at all is to counsel our Unitarian friends to take no notice of this person's attacks on their opinions. He is, we are informed, an ignorant man and a very unscrupulous partizan. A considerable portion of his stock in trade consists in abuse of Unitarians, and if he can succeed in provoking them into personal controversy, he has a profitable vent for his common plans of malediction. Leave such men to their own devices, and they soon cease to attract notice. As the result of a not short observation, we think that even orthodox and apparently consenting audiences really place little confidence in the denunciations uttered by popular orators. The Liverpool jury were, after all, not so

very wrong in assigning a minimum of mischief to the libel of which they found the defendant guilty. He might intend, but he could not inflict, a serious damage on the character of his Unitarian neighbour. The most painful part of the case at Liverpool was the way in which young persons, and even children, were brought into court to justify the libel by very hard swearing, the effect of which in nearly every case was broken down by the cross-examination of the plaintiff's counsel. "The Bible was full of lies," was only an orthodox version of an opinion uttered by the plaintiff respecting the true meaning of a scripture phrase. The grocer of Todmorden and his friend Brindley disliked and disagreed with the interpretation proposed by the schoolmaster, and hence the libel and the evidence by which it was attempted to be justified.—It is far from our intention to recommend silence to Unitarians when attacked and misrepresented. Only let them be prudent in their choice of times and modes of defence. Sermons, lectures, tracts, the public press, all are available to those unjustly assailed; but from personal discussions, and from arguments in a court of law on theology, we expect little good to result.

THE HINDOO MISSION.

We take from the "Monthly Journal of the American Unitarian Association" for August, just received, some interesting extracts from the letters of Mr. Dall.

"Calcutta, May 3, 1860.

"As to the North (or strictly North-west, a thousand or twelve hundred miles), a spirit of inquiry is certainly awakening there.

"Capt. Mercer, the originator of the N.W. Unitarian Christian Association, has been boarding at the same house with me here in Calcutta for the last six or seven weeks; and I may say, that his view of our mission, duty, and our wonderfully rich opportunity of gospelizing India, is nearly identical with your own, as expressed in your last cheering letter to me. He is an incessant labourer himself, and almost literally talks with every man he meets on the subjects of Unitarian truth. He walks late and early, and takes the hand of every man likely to be accessible to his message. He laments every day that Unitarians (N.B.—He was *nurtured* in the Church of England) do not more magnify their calling, and take a positive, and even *aggressive*, position, such as is theirs of right. Would that they might do so, and so move on to victory! The time is ripe for it, especially in India.

During this short stay in Calcutta, Capt. E. S. Mercer has printed several pamphlets and tracts (up to three thousand copies) of his own preparation, and wholly at his own charge. He is also about taking on himself the risk of a journey to England, and taking with him his excellent converts, Abdool Musih and wife,—hoping that our English fellow-believers will shew the same interest in Abdool that his American ones have in Joguth Chunder Gangooly.

“I have letters, quite lately received, from newly stirred inquirers in the Northwest, men whom Capt. Mercer and Abdool chanced to meet on their way down to Calcutta from Peshawur; and so far interested that they have promptly sent down for books and tracts, which I have as promptly posted for them, with letters.

“These North-westerns write in the Perso-Arabic cipher, and I enclose one letter for your inspection. Capt. Mercer is a good Persian scholar, and has translated them for me.

“I have received another, in Oordoo, from Jullunder. I have also the addresses of several good men, Asiatics, who wish to be in correspondence with us at other cities in the Far North-west.

“Capt. Mercer feels almost as if the whole country was ripe for us. He may be over-hopeful; but he believes that a magnificent and gigantic change in religious matters is impending over this age and country; and blessed the man who is on the spot to greet and guide it!

“To turn now to Madras. I have just received a letter from Mr. G. A. Regel, himself a school teacher, and residing quite near the Roberts' chapel, and the only white man who at the present time attends there. At his request, I have sent him to-day forty additional ‘Sunday-School Gazettes,’ and a copy of the selected volume of Channing. He says,—and I have no ground whatever for a suspicion of interested motives,—

“I sincerely wish to devote my leisure moments, if possible, to mission duties, in assisting Brother Roberts till a European missionary is sent out from home. I trust you will have no objections. If this proposal of mine suits your good-will, I think it will be of much good. The schools, if placed under my care, will be on a better footing; as Brother Roberts has too much to do and cannot devote much time to them. I visited the school in Porasawalkum: thirty lads on the register; pre-

sent, twenty-one boys and three girls. These were examined before me. Want of books is their teacher's complaint. I also examined the school in Royapettah, in Brother Roberts's premises; and the lads there are better taught. I have not called to see the other school in that locality. A European must be at the head of these schools, otherwise they will not flourish. There is no system of teaching, neither any order observed. The teachers' complaint is, that they are not (as others) remunerated monthly; and how can they work? The whole truth is this—they are not afraid of Brother Roberts, as he is too mild with them.—The chapel sadly requires repairs; and divine service, either in Tamul or English, must be held every Lord's-day, morning and evening, as well as on a week-day evening. I would not care to undertake the English service. The scanty attendance must not be minded. ‘Where two or three are gathered together,’ you know. I wish the Unitarians every good, and therefore I seek their spiritual welfare. Sunday last being Easter-day, the Lord's Supper was celebrated at the Unitarian chapel: there were upwards of fifty communicants. Brother Roberts is very poor and down-hearted, and needs help.”

ILKESTON, DERBYSHIRE.

The old Unitarian chapel at this place, which has been partially closed for some years, has been re-opened within the last twelve months under the auspices of the North-Midland Unitarian Village Mission Society. Great inconvenience having been experienced hitherto by the Rev. T. R. Elliott in conducting the devotional part of the service, through the want of a regular choir, a few friends at Nottingham have kindly provided a harmonium, which was opened on Sunday, August 19th. A sermon on the occasion was preached by the Rev. P. W. Clayden, of Nottingham, and Mr. Henry Farmer presided at the harmonium. The chapel was excessively crowded. The old chapel is in a very dilapidated and repulsive condition, and some friends from Nottingham who were present were much impressed with the necessity of rebuilding it before any permanent revival of the cause can be expected to result from the labours of any minister, however zealous.

OBITUARY.

April 10, at Ringwood, ELIZABETH, widow of the late John CONWAY, Esq., aged 87.

When real excellence and worth, as exhibited in the life of those who have long shewn a devoted and consistent attachment to the leading doctrines of the Unitarian faith, are removed from sight, we claim the privilege of recording a few of those traits of character by which the departed were distinguished, and by which they endeared themselves to those who lived within the circle of their influence. The deceased was the last but one of her own generation of an old and respectable family of Protestant Dissenters, steadily attached to and consistently holding to the profession of the principles of Christian liberty and religious truth. Her descendants and connections will cherish her memory, both on account of her many virtues and from the uniform kindness which she shewed towards them. We may be allowed to give a few extracts from her funeral sermon, in which some of her many excellent qualities are briefly recorded.

"My fellow-christians, we are called upon on this occasion to pay a tribute to the memory of departed worth. May we be stimulated to walk in her steps and to imitate her example !

"Those who had the satisfaction of knowing intimately the late Mrs. Conway can best bear witness to her numerous good qualities, and can most justly appreciate her character and estimate its worth. It is but fair to state that the religious sentiments and principles which she had formed, while they proved the source of consolation in the days of her happiness and in those of her trials, were at the same time the source whence flowed the many virtues by which her long and useful life was distinguished. They led her to view God as her Heavenly Father, ever desirous of confiding in his goodness and mercy, and deriving consolation and peace from the hopes and promises of the gospel. * * Placed by Providence in a position of life which allowed her to exercise in a more practical manner the kind and benevolent affections and to indulge in the luxury of doing good, she did not forget her responsibility in this respect, and many there are who have reason to cherish a grateful remembrance of her kindness and generosity. Yet was her benevolence singularly free from every approach towards parade and ostentation : to this she had a marked dislike. * * In her home she was distin-

guished for her generous but unostentatious hospitality and for her courteous attention.

* * She was a firm believer in the doctrine of the strict and simple unity of God ; but her attachment to this great and fundamental truth of all religion was unaccompanied with any narrow or exclusive feelings. The essence of real religion she believed to consist in the possession of a spirit and temper in accordance with the life of the Saviour ; and never for a moment did she waver in this pleasing and delightful conviction at which she had arrived. Her religion, therefore, was of a truly practical kind. Having the most enlarged conceptions of the goodness of our Heavenly Father, it was her firm and consistent belief that the good of all sects, of every tribe and kindred, will hereafter partake of the blessings of the Redeemer's kingdom, and be admitted to share in its glories.

"In the exercise of her social and religious duties, and in the public services and ordinances of religion in this place, till growing infirmities confined her to her home, she regularly, consistently and earnestly engaged, and, as you well know, ever took a most lively interest in all proceedings connected with the welfare and prosperity of this congregation. * * She calmly and without a struggle closed a life full of years and usefulness, leaving to all an example of real Christian piety and worth, and to those who knew her more intimately, and especially to those of her own household, a persuasive lesson to copy her many excellences and virtues.

"And to my fellow-christians, especially to those who are not in the habit of worshiping in this place, I may be permitted to say, if to hold a faith that is unencumbered by any inexplicable, degrading or superstitious views of the nature and attributes of Him who is the sole Ruler of the universe and the benevolent Disposer of all events,—if to believe that it is to this ONE gracious and merciful Parent of all that the most reverential feeling and pious regards of the devout soul should at all times be directed,—if to hold that a humble and cheerful acquiescence in the will of Him to whom we justly ascribe every excellence and perfection, is our highest duty and our noblest praise,—if to regard His complacency and delight in those who strive to assimilate their character to that of the Great Founder of our religion, as our best possession and our highest privilege on earth,—if this be

a true estimate of real, genuine, heartfelt religion, then was her life, guided and directed by its sacred influence, a practical proof of the worth of those views that were her best support under trials which she was not unfrequently called upon to bear, both in her own person and in the removal of those who were attached to her by the tenderest family ties. The calmness and fortitude with which she sustained her growing infirmities, and the happy complacency of spirit with which she looked forward to and met her end, are the best comment on her religious faith and convictions that could be given, and they afford the most striking evidence of the benign and happy influence on the mind of the great and holy principles of the gospel in those moments of life when the comforts and consolations of religion are most needed."

Her remains were interred in the family vault in the chapel-yard at Ringwood on Monday, April 16th, by Rev. M. Rowntree, Poole, who also preached on the following Sunday her funeral sermon, which was listened to with a marked and mournful attention by the congregation present, many appearing from other religious societies in the town, desirous by these means of expressing their respect for the memory of the departed and their sympathy with survivors.

R.

June 19, aged 68, FRANCIS AYLMER FROST, Esq., of Queen's Park, Chester. This excellent man was descended from one of not the least eminent of the ejected clergy of 1662,—John Meadows, Fellow of

Christ's College, Cambridge, and Rector of Ousden, in Suffolk. Mr. Frost was through life a quiet but firm supporter of the principles of civil and religious liberty and of Unitarian Nonconformity. In Chester, where he was long and universally known (one of his sons having recently filled the office of Mayor of that ancient city), he was highly respected. The recollection of his unobtrusive virtues is cherished by a large circle of relatives and friends.

June 26, at Gerrards, Gee Cross, Cheshire, Mrs. BETTY OLDHAM, aged 102 years and six months. She lived much respected by her neighbours and her numerous relatives of the families of Ashtons and Oldhams, and her attaining her hundredth year was celebrated by a social party at the house of her great-nephew, Benjamin Ashton, Esq., of Pole Bank. Her remains were interred in the ground of Hyde chapel, and a very beautiful and impressive sermon was preached on the Sunday following her interment by her minister, the Rev. Charles Beard.

July 1, at the house of her son-in-law, S. Roberts, Esq., Witham Bank, Boston, Lincolnshire, aged 70 years, ANN, widow of the late Rev. Richard ASTLEY, formerly of Halifax, Gloucester and Shrewsbury. She was a lineal descendant of Oliver Heywood, the eminent Puritan and Nonconformist divine.

Aug. 5, at Reading, after a long illness, ISABELLA, wife of Rev. H. E. HOWSE, aged 53. Her "record is on high."

MARRIAGES.

July 7, at Lewin's-Mead chapel, Bristol, by Rev. Wm. James, Mr. JOHN PARNALL, of College Green, to MARY, only daughter of Mr. James Verry STAPLES, of Stokes Croft, Bristol.

Aug. 6, at the Unitarian chapel, Plymouth, by Rev. Henry Knott, Mr. JAMES WILLIAM WATERS to EMMA JANE, daughter of Mr. William MACEY, both of Plymouth.

Aug. 7, at the chapel, Little Portland Street, by Rev. Thomas Madge, THOMAS PIX COBB, Esq., of Gloucester Place, Hyde

Park, second son of T. R. Cobb, Esq., of Banbury, to CLARA ANNE, daughter of John WATSON, Esq., of Leinster Gardens.

Aug. 15, at the Ancient chapel, Toxteth Park, Liverpool, by Rev. John Hamilton Thom, HENRY RUSSELL, son of Robert Hyde GREG, Esq., to EMILY, daughter of the late S. S. GAIR, Esq., of Liverpool.

Aug. 19, at the Unitarian chapel, Plymouth, by Rev. Henry Knott, Mr. HENRY GARLAND to MARY, daughter of Mr. Thos. JOHNSON.